FACTORS AFFECTING POLICE DIVERSION OF YOUNG OFFENDERS: A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Peter J. Carrington
University of Waterloo

Report to the Solicitor General Canada

February, 1998

Any views expressed in this report are those of the author alone and do not necessarily represent the views of the University of Waterloo or the Solicitor General Canada.

© Peter J. Carrington, 1998

Table of Contents

Table of Contents ii
List of Tables iv
Executive Summary 6
1. Introduction 1
2. Previous Research 2
3. Data 3
3.1 The Revised Uniform Crime Reporting Survey 3
3.2 Variables 5
3.2.1 Charge status of the accused 7
3.2.2 Location of the incident 8
3.2.3 The gender of the accused 9
3.2.4 The aboriginal status of the accused 9
3.2.5 The age of the accused youth at the time of the incident 9
3.2.6 Consumption of alcohol or drugs by the accused 10
3.2.7 Co-accused adult 10
3.2.8 "Group" crime: number of co-accused youth 10
3.2.9 Type of incident 11
3.2.10 Victim-Accused Relationship 11
3.2.11 Type of weapon present 12
3.2.12 Level of injury to a victim 13
3.2.13 Modus operandi is shoplifting 13
3.2.14 Value of property involved 13
3.2.15 Most serious violation in the incident 13
4. Factors Affecting the Likelihood of Charges Being Laid 14
4.1 The Gender of the Accused 15
4.2 The Aboriginal Status of the Accused Youth 18
4.3 The Age of the Accused 20
4.4 Consumption of Alcohol or Drugs by the Accused 22
4.5 An Adult Co-accused in the Incident 23
4.6 Number of Co-accused Youth 25
4.7 Type of Incident 27
4.8 Relationship Between An Accused and a Victim 29
4.9 Type of Weapon Present 31
4.10 Injury to a Victim 33
4.11 Modus Operandi is Shoplifting 34
4.12 Value of Property Stolen, Damaged, Fraudulently Obtained, or of Illicit Drugs 36
4.13 The Most Serious Violation in the Incident 38
5. Relative Impact of Factors 42
6. Summary and Conclusions 45
Bibliography 49
Appendix A 51

100-07169/

Supporting Tables 51

List of Tables

Table 1 Percent of accused youth charged and processed by other means, by characteristics of the accused and of circumstances of the incident 5
Table 2 The likelihood of charges by the gender of the accused 16
Table 3 The likelihood of charges by the aboriginal status of the accused 18
Table 4 The likelihood of charges by the age of the accused 20
Table 5 The likelihood of charges by consumption by the accused of alcohol or drugs 21
Table 6 The likelihood of charges by the presence of a co-accused adult 22
Table 7 The likelihood of charges by the number of co-accused youth 24
Table 8 The likelihood of charges by the type of incident 25
Table 9 The likelihood of charges by the closest accused-victim relationship 27
Table 10 The likelihood of charges by the presence and type of weapon 29
Table 11 The likelihood of charges by the most serious injury to a victim 30
Table 12 The likelihood of charges by the modus operandi is shoplifting 32
Table 13 The likelihood of charges by the value of property involved 34
Table 14 The likelihood of charges by the most serious violation: person offences 36
Table 15 The likelihood of charges by the most serious violation: property offences 37
Table 16 The likelihood of charges by the most serious violation: other offences 38
Table 17 The impact of characteristics of the accused and the incident on the likelihood of charges being laid 39

Appendix A

Table A-1 Gender of the accused youth by other characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident 48
Table A-2 Aboriginal status of the accused youth by other characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident 50
Table A-3 Age of the accused youth by other characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident 52
Table A-4 Evidence that the accused youth consumed alcohol or drugs by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident 54
Table A-5 Co-accused adult in the incident by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident 56
Table A-6 Number of co-accused young persons in the incident by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident 58
Table A-7 Type of incident by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident 60

Table A-8 Closest victim-accused relationship by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident 62
Table A-9 Type of weapon present by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident 64
Table A-10 Most serious injury suffered by any victim, by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident 66
Table A-11 Modus operandi is shoplifting, by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident 68
Table A-12 Value of property involved, by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident 69
Table A-13 Most serious violation in the incident, by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident (incidents involving offences against the person only) 71
Table A-14 Most serious violation in the incident, by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident (incidents involving offences against property only) 73
Table A-15 Most serious violation in the incident, by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident (incidents involving "other" offences only) ... 74

Executive Summary

This statistical analysis of factors affecting pre-charge diversion of apprehended young persons is based on data from the Revised Uniform Crime Reporting Survey. It includes characteristics of the accused and of the incident for all 94,221 young persons apprehended in 1992 and 1993 by police departments in certain towns and cities in New Brunswick, Ontario, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia, and in almost all of the Province of Quebec. The salience of the following factors was analysed: the gender, aboriginal status and age of the accused; whether the accused consumed alcohol or drugs prior to the incident; the presence of an adult co-accused and the number of co-accused youth; any relationship between an accused and a victim in the incident; the type of weapon present, if any; the level of injury suffered by the victim(s), if any; whether or not the incident involved shoplifting; the value of property involved, if any; and the characterization by police of the most serious violation (offence) in the incident. Data were not available from the UCR on the following variables, which have been found by other research to affect the decision whether to charge juvenile suspects: prior contacts of the accused with the police or the criminal history of the accused, the preference of the victim(s) concerning processing of the accused, the behaviour or "demeanour" of the accused, and the quantity and quality of the "situational evidence"–i.e., evidence which is readily available at the scene and which establishes the involvement of the accused.

In this sample, 59 percent of the young persons apprehended by police were charged or recommended to be charged, and 41 percent were processed "by other means". These proportions varied greatly from province to province. It is difficult to determine to what extent these provincial variations reflect actual differences in charging or differences in recording practices. It is also difficult to know to what extent any actual differences in charging would reflect variations in police practices, since the Crown, screening agencies, and alternative measures programmes have different impacts on the laying of charges in different jurisdictions.

The most important factor in the decision to charge apprehended young persons appears to be the nature of the offence(s) allegedly committed. However, there is no simple relationship between the seriousness of the offence, as it is usually understood, and the probability of charges being laid. There are three broad categories of offences: those against the person ("violent" offences), those against property, and those against neither ("other", or "victimless", offences, including offences against the administration of justice, drug offences, Criminal Code traffic offences, weapons possession and morals offences, and miscellaneous offences). "Other" offences are usually thought of as the least serious offences, but were characterized by the highest proportion (82 percent) of apprehended youth charged. More than half of the young persons apprehended for "other" offences were implicated in offences against the administration of justice, such as fail to appear, violations of bail or probation conditions, and escape custody; of these, 95 percent were charged–a proportion higher than that for any other offence except homicide and attempt murder.

Young persons apprehended for indictable offences against the person were also charged in relatively high proportions, but these were offset by the low proportion charged in the numerous incidents of the hybrid offence of level 1 ("common") assault. The result was an average probability of being charged for young persons apprehended for offences against the person as a whole.

Young persons apprehended for offences against property constituted 71 percent of the sample, and were, as a group, less likely than average to be charged. However, there were large variations in the proportion charged among the types of property offences: higher proportions of young persons apprehended in incidents of possess stolen property, fraud, and break and enter were charged, whereas the numerous cases of theft under and mischief resulted in relatively low proportions of charges.

The age of the accused young person ranked second in its impact on the decision to charge. The probability of being charged increased with each year of age between 12 and 17. Apprehended youths who were 17 years old were twice as likely as 12 year olds to be charged. This was partly due to circumstances of criminal incidents which vary with the age of the accused: the type of offence, the value of property involved, the relationship, if any, between accused and victim, and the involvement of an adult or young offender co-accused. However, much of the relationship between the age of the accused and the likelihood of charges being laid was not due to these factors, and was therefore due to differential treatment of older youth, or to unanalysed factors, such as the criminal history or "demeanour" of the apprehended youth.

The presence of a weapon in the incident, which is recorded in the UCR whether the weapon is used or not, and only in incidents involving offences against the person, is the factor found to have the third-strongest impact on the decision to charge young persons. The presence of a weapon, particularly a firearm, increased the probability of charges considerably, because the presence of a weapon invariably resulted in the incident being characterized by police as involving an indictable rather than a hybrid offence against the person, with a resulting higher probability of a charge being laid. This effect on charging of the presence of a weapon was largely independent of whether or not a victim suffered injury. Although major injury to, or death of, a victim was more likely when an "other" weapon (but not a firearm) was present, and did indeed result in a much higher probability of charges, this event was very rare in incidents involving young offenders. The great majority of youth crime involving offences against the person resulted in minor injury or no injury to the victim(s), and these levels of injury had no effect on the probability of charges being laid. Thus, it appears to be the presence of the weapon itself that increased the probability of charges being laid.

Evidence of consumption of alcohol or drugs by the apprehended youth substantially increased the likelihood of charges being laid. This effect was largely unexplained by other circumstances of the incidents: that is, it appears to be the intoxication itself that increased the probability of being charged–perhaps for reasons of public safety or because of its effect on the "demeanour" of the apprehended youth. However, consumption of alcohol or drugs by

apprehended youth was very rarely recorded in the UCR, so this factor plays only a very minor role in a general explanation of the decision to charge.

The relationship, if any, between an accused person and a victim in the incident had a moderately strong impact on the probability of charges. This factor was recorded only for incidents involving an alleged offence against the person. Charges were most likely to be laid in incidents in which the accused and victim(s) were strangers, and least likely when an accused and a victim had a "non-family" relationship–friend, acquaintance, or business relationship. Young persons apprehended in incidents involving an accused and a victim with a family relationship were charged in average proportions. The higher proportions of charges in incidents involving strangers were partly because these incidents were more likely to involve indictable offences against the person, whereas incidents involving friends and acquaintances were more likely to be characterised as level 1 ("common") assault, which has a relatively low probability of resulting in charges.

Although very few of the sample of apprehended youth were identified by police as aboriginals, these young persons were charged in much higher than average proportions. This is not due to circumstances of incidents involving aboriginal youth, and is therefore due to bias related to aboriginal status itself or to other circumstances of the incident which are not available in the UCR data.

The presence in the incident of an adult co-accused resulted in a small increase in the probability of the apprehended young person being charged. The presence and number of co-accused young persons also affected the likelihood of charging: young persons apprehended alone were more likely to be charged, and those apprehended in incidents involving at least 3 other young persons were least likely to be charged. Part of this differential is due to the types of incidents in which lone youth and groups of youth tend to be apprehended: groups were more likely to be involved in property incidents, which have a lower charge rate, and lone youth were more likely to be implicated in "other" (neither property nor person) incidents, which have a high charge rate.

The value of property involved in the incident–whether stolen, obtained fraudulently, damaged, or the value of illicit drugs–had a moderate effect on the likelihood of charges. Young persons implicated in incidents involving property valued at $25 or less were less likely to be charged; whereas property valued at more than $1,000 increased the likelihood of charges. This is largely because theft under has a lower charge rate; whereas offences which tend to involve higher-valued property, such as break and enter, theft over, and other indictable property offences, have a higher likelihood of charges. An interesting exception is the offence of mischief, which tended to involve property damage estimated to be in the range of $100 to $999 but had a very low charge rate.

Among young persons implicated in property incidents, those apprehended for shoplifting had a slightly higher-than-average chance of being charged. The low value of the property which

is usually involved in incidents of shoplifting tended to offset the aggravating effect of the shoplifting itself on the likelihood of charges being laid.

The factor which had the smallest impact on the probability of charges was the gender of the apprehended youth. Males were slightly more likely than females to be charged, partly because male accused youth were on average a little older than females, and older accused youth were more likely to be charged. The offence profiles of male and female accused youth were different, but the influences of these differences on the likelihood of charging tended to cancel each other out. The difference of 4 percent between proportions of males and females charged which was not explained by other circumstances of the incident may be due to gender discrimination or to other factors, such as demeanour, which were not included in the analysis.

Statistical research such as the present study is inherently limited by its sources of data and its mechanistic approach. It is able to estimate the relative strengths of the effects of different factors, to delineate causal mechanisms, and to point to apparent anomalies. However, it cannot describe the social processes that produce these phenomena. Several of the issues which have been raised but not resolved by this report would best be addressed by field research involving interviews with police officers and other decision-makers, and analysis of documentary evidence such as policy and training manuals.

1. Introduction

Police in Canada lay charges[1] against approximately two-thirds of young persons whom they apprehend (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics 1996). Thus, approximately one-third of young persons who are apprehended by police are not charged and therefore do not receive formal youth court processing. The police are the gatekeepers to the youth justice system, and the decision whether to charge or to process the alleged offender by other means is a decision of great consequence both for the apprehended youth and for the rest of the youth justice system.

For the accused youth, being diverted from formal processing may have several beneficial effects, which can be summarized as the reduction of criminalization and of stigmatization (Federal-Provincial-Territorial Task Force on Youth Justice 1996: Chapter 4). For the administration of youth justice, pre-charge diversion can significantly affect youth court and correctional caseloads; for example, Carrington and Moyer (1994) calculated that there was an increase of approximately 20 percent[2] in caseload referred to the youth court[3] in the first 6 years following the inception of the *Young Offenders Act*, due to an increase in the proportion of juvenile suspects who were charged.

The research reported here addresses the question: What factors differentiate cases in which the apprehended youth is charged from those in which other means are employed? This question is explored by using multivariate analysis of data from the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Survey to develop a model which identifies what factors come into play, and the relative impact of each factor.

This research grows out of a previous project, sponsored by the Department of Justice Canada, which studied the consequences of the age (and gender) of young offenders (Carrington 1996). That project analysed UCR data to explore the relationships between the age and gender of young persons and the amount and seriousness of crime which they committed, and the police response to youth crime. Part of the research involved multivariate analysis of the relationship between the age of the accused youth and the likelihood of charges being laid, while controlling for possible mediating factors (Ibid., Chap. 8). The results confirmed that the age of

---

[1]Or recommend that charges be laid, in jurisdictions where it is the Crown, rather than the police, who makes the decision whether to lay charges against young persons.

[2]Percentaged on the 1980-84 base; this is in addition to the increase in caseload due to the increase in the population of young persons under the jurisdiction of the Youth Court because of the Uniform Maximum Age provision of the YOA.

[3]Or intake screening agencies, in some provinces.

the accused youth does affect the likelihood of being charged but that the effect of the gender of the accused is small or non-existent. In the course of the analysis, numerous other aspects of the case were identified as being correlated with the likelihood of charges being laid; however, no attempt was made to develop a comprehensive model of the decision to charge, since the research was focussed on the age of the young offender, and other factors figured only as control variables.

The present report develops a comprehensive statistical model of factors that differentiate apprehended young persons who are charged from those who are not.

2. Previous Research

The decision whether to lay charges[4] is difficult to study because the work of police officers--unlike that of judges, for example--is concealed from public view, and is not the subject of publicly available records. Most research on this subject has used one of, or a combination of, the following methods: legal analysis, analysis of police department procedural manuals, surveys of or interviews with line and staff officers, and direct observation of police officers at work, for example, by "riding with" officers in police cars (e.g Black and Reiss Jr. 1970; Doob and Chan 1982; Ericson 1981, 1982; Fisher and Mawby 1982; Hornick et al. 1996; Lundman et al. 1978).[5] These methods produce invaluable information which is rich and detailed. A major problem with the direct observational approach, however, is that it is relatively expensive and suffers from problems of coverage, or representativeness, because field research is inherently limited in time and place. A major problem with legal analysis, the use of police manuals and/or surveys of officers is that the researcher learns what officers are *supposed* to do, or what they *believe* they do, or what they *want the researcher to believe* they do, which may differ somewhat from what they actually do. An alternative approach–which is used in the present research--is to use police records, or statistics based on police records, as a "trace" of police activities and decisions (e.g. Carrington 1996; Carrington and Moyer 1994; Krohn et al. 1983; Landau 1981; Landau and Nathan 1983).

Studies of police decisions concerning processing of juvenile suspects–whether conducted in Canada (Conly 1978; Doob and Chan 1982), Britain (Landau 1981; Fisher and Mawby 1982; Landau and Nathan 1983), or the United States (Black and Reiss 1970; Lundman, Sykes and Clark 1978; Krohn, Curry, and Nelson-Kilger 1983)--have reached broadly similar

---

[4]Or to recommend that charges be laid, in some jurisdictions; see Section 3.2.1 below.

[5]Some of these studies also did statistical analysis of police records (see below), but they are included in this group because their main source(s) of data appears to have been one or more of those listed above.

conclusions. The more serious the current offence, the greater the likelihood of formal processing, and the smaller the opportunity for the exercise of discretion. Since police have less discretion in major offences, and more in minor offences, extra-legal variables can play a larger role in incidents involving less serious offences. The preference of the victim/complainant–and therefore the existence of a complainant--is also a crucial factor. For example, Black and Reiss (1970) and Lundman (1978) found that the greater arrest rate of black suspects was due largely to the preference of the complainant (often black also), not police bias. However, the role of the complainant's preference may be decreasing in certain types of crime, such as family violence, because of government or police department "zero-tolerance" policies. Other factors which have repeatedly been identified as salient are the behaviour, or "demeanour", of the suspect when confronted by police, prior contacts with the police, and the situational evidence–that is, the evidence readily available at the scene of the incident–as to the involvement of the suspect. Other factors identified by some, but not all, studies include the age, gender, and race or ethnicity of the suspect, the home situation of the suspect, and the police department in whose jurisdiction the incident occurred: Conly (1978) found very large variations across Canada, even within provinces, in proportions of juvenile suspects charged.

3. Data[6]

3.1 The Revised Uniform Crime Reporting Survey

The approach used here is the bivariate and multivariate analysis of data from the Revised (Incident Based) Uniform Crime Reporting Survey. This relatively new database captures very rich data on criminal incidents, including the age and gender of each apprehended youth; the nature and circumstances of the incident, including type of offence(s), presence of weapons, use of intoxicants, location of offence, value of property involved, level of injury to the victim(s), relationship of accused and victim(s); clearance status of the incident, and whether or not each accused was charged.

Since national[7] annual data based on police occurrence reports are collected and maintained in the Uniform Crime Reporting Survey (UCR) by Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS), the adoption of this method permits studies with national, multi-year coverage. Since these data are based on occurrence reports, which must be relatively accurate because they are used in preparing evidence for court, they can be relied upon to be relatively accurate records of criminal incidents and police responses. The major disadvantage of the UCR data is that they exclude information which is relevant to our research question; for example, the demeanour and

---

[6]This section draws on Carrington (1996: Chapters 3 and 4).

[7]Actually, the data are less than national in coverage: see below.

criminal history of the accused. Nevertheless, the UCR captures enough data on criminal incidents to support statistical analyses that shed light on hypotheses about police decision-making based on richer but less comprehensive data.

Although the Revised UCR Survey began operations in 1988, it did not achieve wide coverage until 1992. The present research uses data for two years--1992 and 1993–in order to double the sample of apprehended young persons to approximately 94,000, and thereby permit precise estimation of the size of effects in multivariate analyses with several predictor variables.

The data in the Revised UCR Survey are captured from the information systems of municipal and provincial police, including provincial police forces that provide municipal policing under contract. Therefore, the data are organized by "police area", i.e. the area of jurisdiction of a police force or police detachment. In 1992 and 1993, police forces in 5 provinces reported to the Revised UCR Survey, covering approximately 23 percent of youth crime known to police in Canada.[8] These were distributed as follows: New Brunswick, 1.2 percent; Province of Quebec, 54.7 percent; Ontario, 24.6 percent; Saskatchewan, 15.2 percent; British Columbia (Vancouver only), 4.3 percent. Clearly, this distribution is not representative of Canada:[9] as well as over-representing central Canada, it omits crime in rural areas and small towns outside Quebec. Since most of the phenomena discussed in this report–such as proportions of apprehended young persons who are charged, types of criminal incidents, use of weapons, and so on--vary substantially across Canada, the simple distributions reported here should be treated with caution. However, the reporting of distributions is not the purpose of the research: rather, it is to assess *relationships among factors*, namely relationships of characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident with the likelihood of charges being laid; and these relationships are unlikely to vary significantly across Canada or over a period of three or four years. For example, if the use of a weapon increased the likelihood of charges being laid in Fredericton and Vancouver in 1992-93, it would no doubt do so in Halifax and Yellowknife in 1997.

Data for accused youth in Metropolitan Toronto were excluded from the analyses in this study, because it is the policy of the Toronto police department not to report data to the UCR Survey for persons implicated in incidents that are "cleared otherwise". Thus, data for young persons charged in Toronto lack a comparison group of young persons processed by other means.

---

[8]Coverage of the Survey was actually approximately 29 percent, but the data used in our analyses omit Metropolitan Toronto; this is explained below.

[9]By 1996, police departments in 6 provinces, representing 47 percent of crime in Canada, were reporting to the Revised UCR Survey. However, these data were still not nationally representative, since they over-represented the Province of Quebec, and urban police departments generally (Kong 1997: 13).

3.2 Variables

Table 1 shows the percentages of apprehended youth who were charged,[10] broken down by characteristics of the accused, circumstances of the incident, and the characterization by the police as to the most serious violation (offence) which occurred. Overall, 59 percent of apprehended youth in this sample were charged, but this proportion varies considerably with the characteristics of the offender and of the incident. These are discussed below, but it must be emphasized at the outset that such variations do not necessarily indicate factors affecting the likelihood of charges being laid. Rather, they give us a first look at possible causal factors, which will be refined in multivariate analysis.

Table 1. Percent of accused youth charged and processed by other means, by characteristics of the accused and of circumstances of the incident

	Charged %	Other means %	Total N	Total %
Total	59.0	41.0	94221	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)				
New Brunswick	68.2	31.8	1135	1.2
Montreal	56.3	43.7	22486	23.9
other Quebec	51.9	48.1	29098	30.9
York Region	43.4	56.6	9937	10.5
other Ontario	59.7	40.3	13204	14.0
Saskatchewan	78.9	21.1	14301	15.2
Vancouver	88.0	12.0	4060	4.3
Gender of the accused				
Female	60.3	39.7	14431	15.3
Male	58.8	41.2	79790	84.7
Aboriginal status of the accused				
Not an aboriginal	57.6	42.4	89045	94.5
Aboriginal	83.5	16.5	5176	5.5
Age of the accused				
12	33.7	66.3	4731	5.0
13	44.5	55.5	8713	9.2
14	53.4	46.6	15325	16.3
15	59.2	40.8	19514	20.7

[10]Or recommended to be charged, in British Columbia; see Section 3.2.1 below. This is implied by "charged" throughout this report.

	Charged %	Other means %	Total N	Total %
16	64.1	35.9	22578	24.0
17	68.1	31.9	23360	24.8
Evidence that the accused consumed alcohol or drugs				
No	58.9	41.1	93809	99.6
Yes	87.9	12.1	412	0.4
Co-accused adult in the incident				
No	57.9	42.1	82242	87.3
Yes	66.8	33.2	11979	12.7
Number of young persons implicated				
Only the accused	63.6	36.4	50035	53.1
1 or 2 co-accused youth	55.9	44.1	36069	38.3
3 or more co-accused youth	44.6	55.4	8117	8.6
Type of incident				
Against the person	59.5	40.5	13159	14.0
Against property	54.3	45.7	67296	71.4
Other	81.7	18.3	13766	14.6
Closest victim-accused relationship				
N/A	58.8	41.2	82304	87.4
Stranger	70.4	29.6	3374	3.6
Unknown	67.3	32.7	892	0.9
Family	62.0	38.0	1164	1.2
Other	54.4	45.6	6487	6.9
Type of weapon present				
N/A	58.7	41.3	82034	87.1
Unknown or none	56.9	43.1	9139	9.7
Other weapon	73.2	26.8	2564	2.7
Firearm	80.0	20.0	484	0.5
Modus operandi was shoplifting				
No	63.4	36.6	82041	87.1
Yes	59.7	40.3	12180	12.9
Level of injury suffered by any victim				
N/A	58.9	41.1	81009	86.0
Unknown or none	57.9	42.1	6886	7.3
Minor injury or death	58.4	41.6	5571	5.9
Major injury or death	84.1	15.9	755	0.8

	Charged %	Other means %	Total N	Total %
Value of property involved				
N/A	70.9	29.1	28085	29.8
0- $25	52.2	47.8	16837	17.9
$26 - 99	55.6	44.4	10321	11.0
$100-499	52.6	47.4	17987	19.1
$500-999	47.2	52.8	7567	8.0
$1,000 +	60.4	39.6	13424	14.2
Most serious violation				
Against the person	**59.5**	**40.5**	**13159**	**14.0**
Homicide, attempt murder	96.4	3.6	84	0.1
Other indictable person	75.8	24.2	4788	5.1
Sexual assault level 1	59.9	40.1	927	1.0
Assault level 1	48.4	51.6	7360	7.8
Against property	**54.3**	**45.7**	**67296**	**71.4**
Possess stolen property	87.3	12.7	4803	5.1
Fraud	69.9	30.1	1660	1.8
Break and enter	63.3	36.7	17301	18.4
Other indictable property	58.9	41.1	7580	8.0
Theft under	45.3	54.7	26494	28.1
Mischief	39.8	60.2	9458	10.0
Other	**81.7**	**18.3**	**13766**	**14.6**
Administration of justice	94.7	5.3	7333	7.8
Traffic	84.4	15.6	1053	1.1
Morals	83.1	16.9	261	0.3
Indictable drug	78.8	21.2	966	1.0
Weapons	69.7	30.3	715	0.8
Summary/hybrid drug	66.0	34.0	1174	1.2
Miscellaneous	51.2	48.8	2264	2.4

3.2.1 Charge status of the accused

For each accused person,[11] the UCR Survey reports whether he or she was charged or "processed

[11]Throughout this report, we use the term "accused (person)" in the same sense as it is used in the reports of the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics that are based on the Revised UCR Survey: "a person who has been identified as an offender in an incident and against whom a charge may be laid in connection with that incident" (1994a: Section 3.2).

by other means". In New Brunswick, Quebec, and British Columbia, charges recommended by police are subject to approval by the Crown. In New Brunswick and Quebec, the accused is coded in the revised UCR Survey as "charged" only if the Crown approves the recommendation to charge. In British Columbia, accused are coded as charged if police recommend charges, regardless of Crown approval. Therefore, "caution should be taken in making comparisons among jurisdictions for this element" (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics 1994a: 15).

"Processed by other means" can mean many things, ranging from an informal warning with no further action, to referral to a pre-charge alternative measures programme. The Revised UCR Survey does not record, for each accused person, the reason for the use of "other means", or the nature of the "other means" employed. However, it does record the "clearance status" of each incident as "cleared by charge" or "cleared otherwise", with detailed information concerning the *reason* (not the mechanism) for an incident being cleared otherwise. During 1992-93, of the 36,764 young persons implicated in incidents recorded by the Revised UCR as "cleared otherwise", 10 percent were for reasons "beyond the control" of the police, such as the death of the accused or of an essential witness, and 90 percent were classified as discretionary–for a specific reason such as the accused being involved in another incident in which charges have been laid or already serving a sentence (20 percent), the complainant declining "to lay charges" (19 percent), or simply "departmental discretion" (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics 1994a: Section 4.5). However, the Survey does not record what proportion of these diversions were to alternative measures programmes, nor to what extent the Crown or a screening agency was involved in the decision not to charge.

Therefore, the decision not to charge should not be regarded as a simple exercise of police discretion. First, the circumstances of the incident may make laying charges infeasible (for example, if the complainant is the key witness and cannot be induced to cooperate) or impossible (for example, if the accused is dead). Second, the decision is by no means always made by police alone.

3.2.2 Location of the incident

The reporting unit for the Revised UCR Survey is the individual police department,[12] but for our analysis, these "police jurisdictions" are grouped into 7 "regions" (Table 1). In the cases of the regions referred to as "New Brunswick," "other Ontario," and "Saskatchewan," it should be kept in mind that not all police forces in these areas reported to the Revised UCR Survey in 1992-93 (see Section 3.1 above).

Proportions of apprehended youth who are charged vary considerably across Canada, being relatively high in New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, and particularly Vancouver, and

[12]Or police detachment, in places such as the Province of Quebec where numerous municipalities are policed by detachments of the same police department (the Sûreté de Québec).

relatively low in York Region (Ontario), and Quebec province outside Montreal.[13] Large regional variations in crime rates have been noted by other authors, who caution strongly against drawing substantive conclusions from them, arguing that they may reflect differences in police strength or reporting practices as well as differences in proportions actually charged (Hackler and Paranjape 1983; Kennedy and Veitch 1997).

Therefore, apart from noting that the likelihood of an incident resulting in charges appears to vary considerably across Canada, we shall not attempt further interpretation of this variation. However, it is crucial to include this jurisdictional variation in analyses of other factors related to charging, because of its potential to cause "spurious correlations" (see Section 4 below).

3.2.3 The gender of the accused

Less than 1 percent of accused were coded as "unknown" gender; these were omitted from all analyses. Consistent with the findings of all previous criminological research, the sample of accused youth is predominately (85 percent) male (Table 1). Male accused youth have an average likelihood of being charged, and the probability of young female accused being charged is only 1 percent higher.

3.2.4 The aboriginal status of the accused

The Revised UCR Survey records whether or not the accused is an aboriginal person.[14] However, only 5.5 percent of the sample of apprehended youth were identified as aboriginals by police (Table 1). This proportion ranged from 0.0 percent in York Region and 0.2 percent in Montreal to 23 percent in Saskatchewan (Table A-2). This information is almost certainly under-reported in some jurisdictions, due both to difficulties of identification and to the reluctance of some police forces to report it.

Among the few accused youth identified by police as aboriginals, 84 percent were charged–a much higher than average proportion. The obvious question, which is addressed in the following sections of the report, is whether this represents bias in charging, or is explicable in terms of other aspects of the incidents involving aboriginal accused youth.

3.2.5 The age of the accused youth at the time of the incident

In the great majority of cases, the age of the accused is calculated from the date of birth of the

---

[13]But see Section 3.2.1 above, concerning the differing meaning of "charged" in different jurisdictions.

[14]I.e. North American Indian, Inuit, or Métis.

accused, a datum in the Revised UCR Survey which is invariably recorded by police, since they use it for identification purposes. In the few cases where the date of birth of the accused is not available, the age of the accused is estimated by the officer (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 1994a).

Half of the sample of accused youth was 16 or 17 years old (Table 1). The number of accused youth increased sharply with age from 12 to 14 years, but there was little difference between the numbers of 16- and 17-year-olds.

The likelihood of charges being laid varies substantially with the age of the accused youth. The proportion charged increases with each year of age from a low of 34 percent of 12-year-old accused to 68 percent of 17-year-olds. The variations with age are particularly pronounced among the youngest accused.

3.2.6 Consumption of alcohol or drugs by the accused

The Revised UCR Survey records whether there was evidence that accused had consumed alcohol or drugs prior to the incident–whether or not intoxication is an issue–only for incidents involving an offence against the person or a traffic offence involving impaired operation. A total of 14,212 young persons were apprehended in such incidents. Only 412, or 2.9 percent of these, were identified as having consumed alcohol or drugs. This seems very conservative, particularly since it is as low as 0.1 percent in some regions (Table A-4).

A high proportion–88 percent--of the accused youth who were identified as having consumed alcohol or drugs prior to the incident were charged.

3.2.7 Co-accused adult

Since the Revised UCR Survey records the age of each person who is implicated in a given incident, it is straightforward to determine which accused youth are implicated in incidents involving an adult co-accused, or other young persons (see below). An adult was apprehended with 12.7 percent of the sample of accused youth. A co-accused adult is much more common for older accused youth: 17 percent of 16-year-old accused and 23 percent of 17-year-olds. Most of the "adults" in this sample who were implicated in incidents involving accused youth were not much over 17 years old (Carrington 1996: 106). Incidents involving a co-accused adult were a little more likely than average (67 percent) to result in the accused youth being charged.

3.2.8 "Group" crime: number of co-accused youth

In approximately 75 percent of incidents in which a young person was implicated, only one young person was involved; 2 or 3 young persons were apprehended in 23 percent of incidents, and 4 or more young persons in 2 percent of incidents (Carrington 1996, Table IV.14). Using the person, rather than the incident, as the unit of count, 53 percent of the young persons in this

sample were apprehended with no co-accused youth, 38 percent with one or two other young persons, and 8 percent with three or more co-accused youth (Table 1). Being apprehended alone was more common among older youth; "group" crimes were more common in the younger age groups.

Incidents in which the accused apparently acted alone were a little more likely than average (64 percent) to result in the accused being charged. Those involving multiple co-accused youth--especially three or more, were less likely to result in any one of those involved being charged; although such incidents could possibly have resulted in high proportions of charges against at least one of the multiple accused youth.

3.2.9 Type of incident

Over 70 percent of the young persons in this sample were apprehended in an incident in which the most serious violation[15] was an offence against property (Table 1).[16] The remaining 30 percent were divided approximately equally between incidents involving an offence against the person, and "other" incidents, in which the most serious violation was directed neither against the person nor against property. Young persons implicated in "other" incidents had a much higher than average probability (81.7 percent) of being charged. Property incidents had a somewhat below-average probability (54.3 percent) of charges, and incidents directed against the person had an average probability.

3.2.10 Victim-Accused Relationship

The Revised UCR Survey captures information about the victim(s) in an incident, and about the presence of weapons, only for incidents involving offences against the person, which account for 14 percent of our sample of accused.

The coding instructions for the UCR Survey specify that, in incidents with multiple accused, the accused serving as the referent of the relationships of all victims is to be selected thus:

- "the accused who committed the most serious violation, if two or more accused commit different violations against the victim", or

---

[15]Specific offences and their characteristic probabilities of resulting in charges being laid are discussed below.

[16]The coding rules of the UCR Surveys rank offences as: against the person, against property, and "other". Thus, the "most serious violation" in an incident involving an offence against the person, an offence against property, and an "other" offence would be coded as "against the person".

- "the closest relationship to the victim if two or more accused commit the same most serious violation against the victim"

(Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics 1994a). Thus, particular accused cannot be associated with particular victims.

For the majority of young persons apprehended in "person" incidents, at least one accused and one victim were not strangers. In approximately half of this group of accused youth, the closest victim-accused relationship was "other"–friend, acquaintance or business relationship (Appendix, Table A-8). Another 9 percent[17] had a family relationship with a victim in the incident. For another 25 percent, victim(s) and accused were strangers.

Young persons implicated in incidents in which an accused and a victim had a non-family relationship were less likely than average to be charged; whereas, those implicated in incidents in which accused and victims had a family relationship or were strangers or had unknown relationships were more likely to be charged. As with the other factors discussed above, this is not necessarily because of the relationship itself, but could be, for example, because of the types of offences involving strangers versus friends. This is explored below.

3.2.11 Type of weapon present

"Weapon" is broadly defined by the UCR to include anything that is used or intended to be used to cause or threaten death or injury to persons; including, for example, verbal threats, threatening gestures, and physical force (i.e. the assailant's body). This data element is coded for weapons that are *present* at the incident, whether used or not, but only for incidents involving an offence against the person. In practically all such incidents, the type of "most serious weapon" was recorded: it was coded as "unknown" for less than 1 percent of young accused involved in "violent" incidents. The UCR uses 13 weapon codes, ranging from "fully automatic firearm" to "threat" and "no weapon". These were aggregated into three categories in the analyses: firearm, other weapon, and no weapon (including "physical force" and "threat") (Table 1).

Only 3.7 percent of the young persons implicated in "person" incidents (or 0.5 percent of the accused youth in the total sample) were apprehended in an incident in which a firearm was present (Appendix, Table A-9); a large proportion (80 percent) of these were charged. Twenty percent of the young persons implicated in "person" incidents were associated with an "other" weapon; these were charged in almost as high proportions as those associated with a firearm. For about three-quarters of young persons implicated in incidents involving an offence against the person, there was no weapon other than "force" or threats, or the type of weapon was not known.

---

[17]Or their co-accused.

3.2.12 Level of injury to a victim

Where more than one victim was involved in an incident, the incident was characterized by the most serious injury coded for any victim. All accused implicated in an incident received the same code for this variable, whether or not a particular accused was involved in inflicting the injury.

The few young persons (755) implicated in incidents in which a victim suffered major injury[18] or death had a high likelihood of being charged (Table 1). Those implicated in incidents in which a victim suffered minor injury[19] had an average probability of being charged.

3.2.13 Modus operandi is shoplifting

For 18 percent of young persons apprehended in incidents directed against property, the incident was characterized by police as involving shoplifting (Appendix, Table A-11). The proportion of these accused youth who were charged was approximately average overall (60 percent), but this proportion is relatively high for accused implicated in offences against property, of whom only 54 percent were charged.

3.2.14 Value of property involved

The value of property stolen, obtained by fraud, or damaged in the incident, or the "street" value of illicit drugs (for drugs offences) was coded for a variety of types of incidents involving 70 percent of the total sample of accused youth (Appendix, Table A-12). This variable was only weakly and inconsistently associated with the likelihood of charges being laid: youth implicated in incidents involving property valued at less than $25 or from $100 to $999 were a little less likely to be charged, and those in incidents involving property valued at $26 to $99 or over $1,000 were a little more likely to be charged.[20]

3.2.15 Most serious violation in the incident

For each incident, police report to the Revised UCR the most serious offence which allegedly took place, whether or not charges were laid. Since it is always the most serious violation which is reported, and many incidents involve multiple violations, this variable overestimates the proportions of the more serious, and underestimates the proportions of the less serious,

---

[18]I.e. requiring "professional medical attention at the scene or transportation to a medical facility" (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics 1994).

[19]I.e. requiring no medical treatment, or only first aid (Ibid.).

[20]Using as a baseline the proportion charged of accused implicated in incidents involving property offences--54 percent–since property offenders made up 95 percent of this group.

violations. It should be noted that, even if an accused was charged, s/he was not necessarily charged with this offence: the "most serious violation" is a way of characterizing the incident, rather than the culpability of any particular person implicated in it.

This characterization of the incident has a strong relationship with the likelihood of charges being laid: offences against the administration of justice, such as fail to appear, bail violations, and failure to comply with a disposition, are very likely to result in charges, probably because of the limited discretion afforded to police in such cases (Table 1). High proportions of accused were also charged in incidents involving traffic and morals offences, indictable drug offences, possess stolen property and fraud, and homicide and indictable offences against the person; whereas incidents involving most offences against property and most hybrid offences against the person and "other" offences resulted in average or below-average proportions of charges. Incidents involving three "most serious violations" account for almost half (46 percent) of all accused youth, and are characterized by substantially below-average rates of charging: level 1 assault (48 percent of accused youth were charged), theft under (45 percent were charged), and mischief (40 percent were charged).

4. Factors Affecting the Likelihood of Charges Being Laid

Although the analysis of proportions charged which is presented above can be illuminating, it can also be misleading and, at the same time, insufficiently informative. One can easily be misled if one reads causal efficacy into these percentages. For example, the high percentage of aboriginal accused youth who were charged might be interpreted as indicating that being an aboriginal increases the likelihood of being charged. However, before concluding this, we must check whether there is any other factor which might be causing a coincidental correlation between being aboriginal and being charged–what is known as a "spurious correlation", although a more precise description would be "a spurious attribution of causality to a non-causal correlation". In this case, it is conceivable that the police jurisdiction might be such a factor: if aboriginal accused youth tend to be concentrated in the jurisdictions of certain police forces, and these police forces also tend to have high charge rates (for all apprehended youth, not only aboriginals), then aboriginal youth would have high charge rates *because of where they were located*, not because they were aboriginal. Of course, non-aboriginal youth in these jurisdictions would also have high charge rates, but these would be diluted by the large numbers of non-aboriginal youth in other police jurisdictions with lower charging rates. Similar explanations can be suggested for the other correlations described above.

Spurious imputations of causality can be avoided by "controlling for", or "holding constant" the factor(s) suspected to be causing accidental correlations. For example, the correlation between aboriginal status and percentage of apprehended youth charged can be examined in a separate table for each police jurisdiction, or within groups of similar police jurisdictions. However, it would be tedious, and difficult to summarize, if all potentially

spurious relationships were examined in multiple tables. The same result can be obtained by using multiple regression or analysis of variance, in which the size of the association between independent and dependent variables is estimated, while statistically holding the other independent variables constant. This method is used below.

A somewhat different problem of interpretation arises even if spurious correlation is ruled out. Suppose that controlling for the police jurisdiction does not affect the relationship between aboriginal status and likelihood of being charged, so that we can conclude that being aboriginal increases the likelihood of being charged. The question remains: Why are aboriginal accused youth charged in higher proportions? Is it because they are aboriginal?–or because incidents in which they are implicated are the types of incidents which have a high likelihood of resulting in charges? This issue is different from that of spurious correlation, because here we are not questioning whether aboriginal status is the ultimate cause of the higher likelihood of being charged. Rather, we are asking about the proximate cause: is it the fact of being aboriginal in itself, or is there some *mediating* factor which explains why aboriginal accused youth tend to be charged in higher proportions? For example, are aboriginal youth more likely to be implicated in incidents involving indictable offences against the person, or the presence of a firearm, which–whether the accused is aboriginal or not–tend to result in charges being laid? We can test such possibilities using the same statistical techniques–multiple regression or analysis of variance–as that are used to check for spurious correlation; the difference is that here we are investigating possible mediating factors, whereas for spurious correlation, we investigate causally *antecedent* factors.

In the analysis which follows, we use both procedures described above in an attempt to reach more valid conclusions concerning the effects of various factors on the likelihood of being charged. However, the introduction of variables as statistical controls is limited by the variables which are available in the data. One would need an infinite number of variables in order to test for all possible sources of spuriousness, and all possible mediating causal paths. In the present research, we lack data on certain variables which have been shown to affect the likelihood of charges being laid, such as the prior record and demeanour of the accused. Therefore, we will not be able to produce definitive conclusions. In principle, no causal research which depends upon statistical controls can ever be definitive, because there are always additional possible variables to be controlled. Nevertheless, we are able to investigate some of the most likely sources of spuriousness and mediating causal paths, and thereby produce estimates of effects that are considerably more accurate than those which are based on entirely "uncontrolled" associations, such as those shown in Table 1.

4.1 The Gender of the Accused

There is practically no difference in the proportions of male and female apprehended youth who were charged (Table 2, first row). This would seem to indicate that the gender of the offender has no effect on the likelihood of being charged. Before concluding this, we re-calculate the proportions charged, while controlling for the region, in case a *spurious non-correlation* has

occurred, which in fact it has. In Table 2, the proportions charged, adjusted for the effect of regional variations in charging, show a small but significant[21] difference: male accused youth are 4.5 percent more likely to be charged than females. This difference was hidden in the unadjusted (overall) proportions charged, because male accused are over-represented in jurisdictions characterized by relatively low charge rates (Quebec outside Montreal, and York Region); whereas, female accused youth are over-represented in the "high-ratio" police jurisdictions in New Brunswick, Saskatchewan and Vancouver (Appendix, Table A-1).

Table 2. The likelihood of charges by the gender of the accused

	Female % charged	Male % charged	Difference %	Due to this variable
Unadjusted	60.3	58.8	-1.5	
Adjusted for antecedents (region)	55.2	59.7	4.5	6
Adjusted for age of the accused	57.2	59.3	2.1	2.4
Adjusted for type of incident	56.8	59.4	2.7	-0.5
Adjusted for M.O. is shoplifting	55.4	59.7	4.2	-1.6
Adjusted for value of property	55.5	59.6	4.2	0.1
Adjusted for most serious violation	55.6	59.6	4.0	0.2

We can conclude, therefore, that the gender of the apprehended youth has a small but significant effect on the likelihood of charges being laid: males are 4.5 percent more likely to be charged than females. Does this suggest gender discrimination, or is the difference in charging due to some legitimate difference between incidents involving female and male accused? To answer this question, we examine, in Table 2, the mediating causal paths between the gender of the accused and the likelihood of being charged.

The main factor mediating the effect of the gender of the accused on the likelihood of charges is the age of the accused at the time of the incident. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that, on average, female young offenders begin and cease offending at an earlier age than males, with the result that females are over-represented among apprehended youth in the lower part of the young offender age range, and males are over-represented in the later years (Table A-1). Since the age of the accused affects the likelihood of charges being laid, with older youth more likely to be charged than younger accused (see below), the higher average age of males partly explains why they are more likely to be charged. This factor accounts for about half (2.4 percent

[21]We use "significant" here in the statistical sense: that this difference, though small, is larger than is likely to have happened by chance, and therefore reflects a real difference between male and female accused youth. Because of the large sample (n=94,221), we have used throughout this study a very stringent criterion for significance: we consider as significant only those differences which have less than a 1 in 1,000 probability of having arisen by chance.

of 4.5 percent) of the effect of the age of the accused on the likelihood of being charged.

The type of incident–whether directed against person, property, or neither–explains a small part of the effect of the gender of the accused youth on the likelihood of charges being laid. Male accused are slightly more likely to be involved in property incidents, and less likely to be involved in incidents involving offences against the person or "other" offences (Table A-1). However, property incidents have a lower than average likelihood of resulting in charges, and incidents involving neither person nor property offences have a much higher than average likelihood of resulting in charges (Table 1).[22] This results in a small *reduction* in the proportion of male accused who were charged (Table 2)–that is, an effect that is contrary to the overall association between being male and being charged. This offsetting effect is itself slightly offset by a contrary tendency for male accused to be over-represented in specific offence types that have higher-than-average likelihoods of charges, within the general categories of offence against the person, property and "other". For example, male accused are over-represented in incidents involving the offences of homicide and attempt murder and break and enter, which have relatively high probabilities of resulting in charges, relative to offences against the person and against property respectively. Female accused are over-represented in the relatively high diversion offences of assault level 1 and theft under.

The other factor that plays a substantial mediating role is the modus operandi of the incident: specifically, whether or not it involved shoplifting. Sixty percent of incidents of shoplifting resulted in charges, compared to 54 percent of property offences in general (Table 1).[23] Female accused youth were massively over-represented in incidents of shoplifting: they accounted for 46 percent of shoplifting incidents, although they constituted only 15 percent of the sample. Like the effect of the type of incident (discussed above), this negative association between being male and shoplifting *decreases* the likelihood of male accused being charged: that is, it offsets somewhat the overall tendency for male accused youth to be charged more than females.

---

[22]The third category–incidents involving an offence against the person–has an average likelihood of resulting in charges (Table 1).

[23]Although in many incidents of shoplifting, the "most serious violation" is theft under, the two concepts are distinct, and are distinguished by the multivariate analyses reported here. Shoplifting incidents have a higher-than-average likelihood (60 percent versus 54 percent for property offences overall) of resulting in charges; theft under has a lower-than-average chance (45 percent) of resulting in charges (Table 1). The result of these two effects is: youth implicated in incidents characterized by police as shoplifting *and* theft under had an approximately average likelihood (55 percent) of being charged; those implicated in shoplifting which was not not theft under were charged in very high proportions (90 percent), and those involved in theft under which was not shoplifting had a relatively low probability (39 percent) of being charged.

After identifying and estimating the size of the causal paths–both positive and negative--mediating the effect of the gender of the accused on the likelihood of charges being laid, we are left with a difference in proportion charged between male and female accused youth of 4.0 percent.[24] This is the difference which is left unexplained when all the variables which potentially mediate the effect of gender on charging have been considered. This 4 percent difference represents either gender discrimination in charging, or the effect of some mediating variable which was not available to the analysis: for example, the prior record or demeanour of the accused.

4.2 The Aboriginal Status of the Accused Youth

The proportion of apprehended youth identified by police as aboriginals who were charged is very high: 83.5 percent, compared with 57.6 percent for non-aboriginals (Table 3, row 1). However, Table A-2 shows that aboriginal accused youth are concentrated in Saskatchewan and Vancouver, which have the highest rates of charging (Table 1). The possibility that the high proportions of aboriginal youth charged could be due to the high charge rates of the jurisdictions in which they are concentrated is tested in the second line of Table 3. To some extent, this is true: the second line of Table 3 shows that when the region is statistically controlled, the difference between the charge rates for apprehended aboriginal and non-aboriginal youth is cut in half–to 11.2 percent. This means that if apprehended aboriginal youth were distributed equally across all regions in this sample, the difference between their charge rates and those of non-aboriginal youth would be 11.2 percent. We now investigate the extent to which this difference can be explained by the characteristics of cases involving aboriginal youth.

[24]This is the difference shown in Table 2 after adjusting for the last intervening variable, the most serious violation in the incident.

Table 3. The likelihood of charges by the aboriginal status of the accused

	Aboriginal % charged	Not aboriginal % charged	Difference %	Due to this variable
Unadjusted	83.5	57.6	25.9	
Adjusted for antecedents (region)	69.6	58.4	11.2	14.7
Adj. for gender of the accused	69.5	58.4	11.1	0.1
Adj. for age of the accused	69.9	58.4	11.5	-0.4
Adj. for consumption of alcohol/drugs	69.9	58.4	11.5	0.0
Adj. for adult co-accused	69.5	58.4	11.1	0.3
Adj. for number of co-accused youth	69.7	58.4	11.3	-0.2
Adj. for type of incident	70.9	58.3	12.6	-1.3
Adj. for victim/accused relationship	70.9	58.3	12.6	0.0
Adj. for M.O.: shoplifting	71.1	58.3	12.8	-0.3
Adj. for type of weapon	71.1	58.3	12.7	0.1
Adj. for injury to victim	71.1	58.3	12.8	0.0
Adj. for value of property involved	70.9	58.4	12.6	0.2
Adj. for most serious violation	69.0	58.4	10.6	2.0

Table 3 shows that the main factors mediating the effect of aboriginal status on the likelihood of being charged are the age of the accused, the type of incident (against person, property, or neither), and the most serious violation in the incident; but that none of these plays a very large mediating role. Although many of the other case characteristics are correlated with aboriginal status (Table A-2), their mediating role is negligible. Aboriginal accused youth tend to be younger than non-aboriginals, which *reduces* their probability of being charged[25]–thus partially offsetting the overall tendency for aboriginal accused to be charged in higher proportions. Their over-representation in incidents involving the relatively high-charge property violations of possess stolen property and break and enter, and their under-representation in the very low-charge offences of theft under and mischief, explain 2.3 percent, or about one-fifth, of the overall charge rate differential of 11.2 percent between aboriginal and non-aboriginal youth.

After reviewing these mediating paths between aboriginal status and the likelihood of charges being laid, we are left with an unexplained differential of 10.6 percent between aboriginal and non-aboriginal youth. Either being aboriginal in itself causes a higher probability of being charged, or there are other factors intervening which are not captured in these data.

[25]Since proportion charged increases with age (see below).

4.3 The Age of the Accused

The first row of Table 4 shows that the likelihood of charges being laid varies substantially with the age of the accused at the time of the incident. The proportion charged rises from 34 percent of 12-year-olds to 68 percent of 17-year-olds. Although in the youngest age groups, the proportion charged rises by 10 percent per year of age, the average increase in proportion charged per year of age is 6.1 percent. However, it is possible that part of this apparent effect may be spurious, due to the confounding effect of the region in which the incident occurred and/or the effect of the gender of the accused. Therefore, we adjust the association between the age of the accused and the likelihood of being charged for these two possible sources of spuriousness.

The result of adjusting for spuriousness is shown in the second row of Table 4. In fact, the association between the age of the accused and the likelihood of being charged is stronger when possible sources of spuriousness are controlled. The full effect of the age of the accused is concealed in the unadjusted percentages because of the suppressive effect of the region in which the incident occurred– a similar phenomenon to that observed in the analysis of the effect of the gender of the accused (above). The other antecedent variables--the gender and aboriginal status of the accused–have no effect. Accused youth tend to be older in the province of Quebec, including Montreal and environs (Table A-3), but this province is characterized by lower rates of charging than the other regions in the sample (Table 1). On the other hand, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan have relatively high rates of charging and lower average ages of accused youth. The change from 6.1 percent to 6.6 percent in the mean increase per year in proportion of accused youth charged can be interpreted to mean that if average ages of accused and/or the rate of charging apprehended youth were the same in all regions, then the mean increase per year of age in proportion charged would be 6.6 percent.

Table 4. The likelihood of charges by the age of the accused

	Age of the accused						Average	Due to
	12	13	14	15	16	17	change	this
	% chgd	% chgd	% chgd	% chgd	% chgd	% chgd	%	variable
Unadjusted	33.7	44.5	53.4	59.2	64.1	68.1	6.1	
Adjusted for antecedents	31.6	42.8	53.1	59.3	64.7	68.7	6.6	-0.5
Adj. for consumption of alcohol/drugs							6.6	0.0
Adjusted for adult co-accused							6.4	0.2
Adjusted for number of co-accused youth							6.0	0.3
Adjusted for type of incident							5.7	0.3
Adjusted for victim/accused relationship							5.6	0.2
Adjusted for type of weapon							5.5	0.0
Adjusted for injury to victim							5.5	0.0
Adjusted for value of property involved							5.4	0.1
Adjusted for most serious violation							4.6	0.8

The rest of Table 4 addresses the issue of the interpretation of this mean increase of 6.6 percent per year of age in proportion charged. Does it show the effect of the age of the accused itself, or does it reflect the effects of other aspects of criminal incidents that are affected by the age of the accused? Table A-3 in the Appendix shows that almost every aspect of the incident is related to the age of the accused youth. Older accused youth are more likely to have consumed intoxicants, to have an adult co-accused, to be the only young person implicated in the incident, to be implicated in incidents involving "other" violations, to be implicated in incidents involving a stranger as a victim, a firearm, major injury or death, and property worth more than $500. Incidents in which older youth are implicated are more likely to be characterized by police as involving homicide or attempt murder, fraud, indictable person and property offences, traffic, morals, and drug offences. However, only a few of these variables mediate the effect of the age of the offender on the likelihood of being charged.

Circumstances of the incident–the involvement of an adult co-accused, the number of co-accused youth, the relationship, if any, between an accused and a victim, and the value of property stolen, damaged or fraudulently obtained--account for a total of 0.8 percent of the 6.6 percent increase with age in the probability of being charged (Table 4). The most serious violation–whether against the person, against property, or neither, and the specific types of property and "other" offences involved–account for an additional 1.1 percent. The remaining 4.6 percent per year of age increase in the probability of being charged is not accounted for by mediating variables, and represents either a true effect of the age of the accused itself, or the influence of omitted variables. It is likely that part of this unexplained effect is due to the prior record of the accused youth, which could reasonably be expected to grow with age, and to increase the likelihood of charges being laid.

4.4 Consumption of Alcohol or Drugs by the Accused

This information was rarely recorded, but accused youth who were identified as having consumed alcohol or drugs were much more likely than others to be charged: 87.9 percent versus 59 percent: a differential of almost 30 percent (Table 5, row 1). Table A-4 shows the necessity of checking for spuriousness: reported consumption of alcohol or drugs by accused youth is higher in high-charge Saskatchewan, and among aboriginal and older youth. When these confounding variables (region, gender, aboriginal status, and age) are controlled, the differential falls to 19 percent (Table 5), which is therefore the increase in the probability of charges due to consumption of alcohol or drugs by the accused. We next explore to what extent this higher rate of charging can be explained by characteristics of incidents in which these accused are implicated.

Most of the effect of consumption of alcohol or drugs on the likelihood of being charged–17.2 percent of 19.3 percent–is unexplained by mediating factors; unless other unmeasured factors play a role, it is the intoxication itself that increases the probability of the accused being charged. Since so few accused youth are identified as having consumed alcohol or drugs, perhaps only the most obvious cases of intoxication are reported. In that case, it would not be surprising if this increased the probability of charges being laid, particularly since it would probably affect the "demeanour" of the accused.

Table 5. The likelihood of charges by consumption by the accused of alcohol or drugs

	Evidence of consumption % charged	No evidence % charged	Difference % charged	Due to this variable
Unadjusted	87.9	58.9	29.0	
Adjusted for antecedents	78.2	58.9	19.3	9.7
Adjusted for adult co-accused	77.9	58.9	19.0	0.3
Adjusted for number of co-accused youth	76.9	58.9	18.0	1.0
Adjusted for type of incident	78.2	58.9	19.3	-1.4
Adjusted for victim/accused relationship	75.5	58.9	16.6	2.8
Adjusted for type of weapon	75.9	58.9	16.9	-0.4
Adjusted for injury to victim	75.5	58.9	16.6	0.3
Adjusted for value of property involved	75.2	58.9	16.2	0.4
Adjusted for most serious violation	76.2	58.9	17.2	-1.0

However, certain circumstances of the incident do play a small role in mediating the effect of alcohol or drug consumption. It is more common in incidents involving no other co-accused youth (Table A-4), which are more likely to result in charges (Section 4.6, below). It is

much more common in incidents in which the victim is a stranger, which are also more likely to result in charges. No accused who were implicated in incidents involving offences against property were identified as having consumed alcohol or drugs, and it is these incidents which are least likely to result in charges; however, this is merely an artifact of the coding rules of the Revised UCR Survey, which permits reporting of consumption of alcohol or drugs only in incidents involving an offence against the person or a traffic offence involving impairment. Again, as a result of the coding rules of the UCR, among incidents involving an "other" offence, it is restricted to traffic incidents.

4.5 An Adult Co-accused in the Incident

Young persons who are apprehended in incidents in which an adult is also apprehended are 9 percent more likely to be charged than those who have no adult co-accused (Table 6, first row). Almost half of this difference is spurious (Table 6, second row), almost entirely because older apprehended youth are much more likely to have a co-accused adult (Table A-5), and are also much more likely to be charged (see above).

Table 6. The likelihood of charges by the presence of a co-accused adult

	Co-accused adult % charged	No co-accused adult % charged	Difference % charged	Due to this variable
Unadjusted	66.8	57.9	9.0	
Adjusted for antecedent variables:				
Adjusted for region	68.4	57.6	10.8	-1.8
Adjusted for gender of the accused	68.3	57.7	10.7	0.2
Adj. for aboriginal status of the accused	68.0	57.7	10.3	0.3
Adjusted for age of the accused	63.1	58.4	4.7	5.6
Adjusted for intervening variables:				
Adjusted for type of incident	65.6	58.0	7.6	-2.8
Adjusted for victim/accused relationship	65.4	58.1	7.3	0.2
Adjusted for M.O. is shoplifting	65.8	58.0	7.8	-0.4
Adjusted for type of weapon	65.3	58.1	7.2	0.6
Adjusted for injury to victim	65.2	58.1	7.2	0.1
Adjusted for value of property involved	64.8	58.2	6.7	0.5
Adjusted for most serious violation	63.6	58.3	5.3	1.4

Although there are two characteristics of incidents involving a co-accused adult which play a substantial role in explaining the influence of this factor on the likelihood of being charged, these two factors–and other less important ones--offset each other, leaving the unexplained differential approximately as large after they are accounted for. The type of incident has a large mediating role (Table 6). Incidents involving a co-accused adult are more likely to be directed against property, which *reduces* the likelihood of charges being laid, and much less likely to be against neither person nor property, which also reduces the likelihood of charging. Thus, the type of incident involving co-accused adults tends to offset the overall positive association between a co-accused adult and the likelihood of being charged. However, the most serious violation within types of incidents does contribute to the overall increase in charge rate associated with a co-accused adult. Among incidents directed against the person, an adult co-accused increases the likelihood that they will involve homicide, attempt murder, or other indictable offences, which have higher probabilities of resulting in charges; and decreases the likelihood of involving level 1 sexual assault or assault, which have lower probabilities of resulting in charges. Similarly, property incidents involving co-accused adults tend to be break and enter (especially), and also fraud or indictable property offences, all of which attract higher proportions of charges; and are unlikely to be theft under or mischief, which have low rates of charging. However, among incidents of "other" offences, this pattern is not present: a co-accused adult is more likely in incidents involving especially indictable, but also summary and hybrid,

drug offences, morals offences, and miscellaneous offences, all of which except morals offences have lower-than-average charge rates.

Having a co-accused adult is also associated with (the accused youth) being male, aboriginal, consuming alcohol or drugs, having 3 or more co-accused youth, the presence of a weapon, particularly a firearm, a victim who is a stranger and who suffers major injury or death, property stolen or damaged with a relatively high value, and a low likelihood of the incident being shoplifting (Table A-5). However, these other correlates of the adult co-accused do not play a substantial role in explaining why young accused with a co-accused adult are more likely to be charged.

Having controlled for all factors available to the analysis, we are left with a differential in charging of 5.3 percent between youth apprehended with and without a co-accused adult. This might represent a greater tendency to lay charges when an adult is involved in the incident, regardless of any substantive factors.

4.6 Number of Co-accused Youth

A young person is most likely to be charged if implicated in an incident involving no other youth, and least likely to be charged in incidents involving 3 or more co-accused youth (that is, a total of 4 or more young persons apprehended in the incident). In the first row of Table 7, there is an average difference of approximately 9 percent between each category of accused youth: those apprehended alone,[26] those with 1 or 2 co-accused youth, and those with 3 or more co-accused youth. However, only 5.4 percent difference remains after controlling for sources of spuriousness: the region, and the age of the accused. Young persons are least likely to be apprehended alone, and most likely to be apprehended with 3 or more co-accused, in Quebec province and York Region (Table A-6), which have low charge rates (Table 1): this creates a spurious correlation between the number of co-accused youth and the likelihood of being charged. A similar effect is created by the tendency for younger accused, who are less likely to be charged, to be apprehended in groups, and for older accused, with higher charge rates, to be apprehended alone (or with adult co-accused). Controlling for these spurious effects, and the negligible effects of the gender and aboriginal status of the accused, leaves an average difference of 5.4 percent, which is the actual effect on the probability of being charged of the number of apprehended youth in the incident.

Table 7. The likelihood of charges by the number of co-accused youth

	None	1 or 2 co-accused youth	3 or more co-accused youth	Average difference	Due to this variable

[26]Or with co-accused adult(s).

	% charged	% charged	% charged	% charged	
Unadjusted	63.6	55.9	44.6	8.8	
Adjusted for antecedent variables:					
Adjusted for region	62.7	56.8	46.5	7.2	1.6
Adjusted for gender of the accused	62.7	56.8	46.2	7.3	-0.1
Adj. for accused aboriginal status	62.7	56.8	46.1	7.3	0.0
Adjusted for age of the accused	61.5	58.1	47.4	5.4	1.9
Adjusted for intervening variables:					
Adjusted for type of incident	59.6	60.4	49.2	2.7	2.7
Adj. for victim/accused relationship	59.7	60.3	48.9	2.9	-0.2
Adjusted for M.O. is shoplifting	59.6	60.3	49.5	2.6	0.3
Adjusted for type of weapon	59.8	60.2	49.3	2.8	-0.2
Adjusted for injury to victim	59.8	60.1	49.2	2.9	-0.1
Adj. for value of property involved	59.7	60.2	49.2	3.0	-0.1
Adjusted for most serious violation	59.8	60.1	49.5	2.9	0.1

Half of this effect is mediated by the type of incident. Groups of (2 or more) youth are much more likely to be apprehended in property incidents–which have the lowest probability of resulting in charges--less likely in incidents directed against the person–which have an intermediate likelihood of resulting in charges--and least likely in incidents involving "other" offences, which have the highest likelihood of charges. Controlling for this intervening factor reduces the differential in charging between lone apprehended youth and those apprehended with 1 or 2 co-accused youth almost to nothing, leaving unexplained only the differential between these and youths apprehended in groups of 4 or more. No other intervening factor explains much of this differential, suggesting the possibility that when incidents involve a sizeable group of young persons (i.e. 4 or more), individual responsibility may be diluted in the eyes of police, so that any one member of the group is less likely to be charged–although there may be a relatively high likelihood of at least one participant being charged.

4.7 Type of Incident

Youth apprehended in incidents directed against the person have an approximately average chance of being charged (59.5 percent; Table 8, row 1), while those implicated in incidents against property are less likely to be charged (54.3 percent), and those in incidents involving "other" offences are much more likely to be charged (81.7 percent). The relationship between the likelihood of being charged and the type of incident can be summarized with the beta statistic, which has a value of 0.194.[27]

Table 8. The likelihood of charges by the type of incident

	Against property % chgd.	Against the person % chgd.	Other % chgd.	Strength of relationship beta	Change in beta due to this variable
Unadjusted	54.3	59.5	81.7	0.194	
Adjusted for antecedent variables:					
Adjusted for region	55.1	58.7	78.3	0.164	0.03
Adj. for gender of the accused	55.1	58.8	78.4	0.165	0.00
Adj. for accused aboriginal status	55.0	58.8	78.7	0.168	0.00
Adj. for age of the accused	55.5	59.2	76.1	0.145	0.02
Adj. for consumption of alcohol or drugs	55.6	58.7	76.2	0.145	0.00
Adj. for co-accused adult	55.4	58.8	76.8	0.149	0.00
Adj. for number of co-accused youth	55.5	58.7	76.4	0.148	0.00
Adjusted for intervening variables:					
Adj. for victim	54.8	45.9	76.5	0.171	-0.02
Adj. for M.O. is shoplifting	54.5	46.8	77.6	0.176	-0.01
Adj. for weapon	55.6	39.8	78.6	0.207	-0.03
Adj. for injury to victim	55.7	39.8	78.6	0.207	0.00
Adj. for value of property involved	56.8	36.9	75.7	0.205	0.00

Part of this relationship–0.03 of the beta value of 0.19–is spurious, due primarily to the

[27]We cannot use the difference of percentages, as in the previous analyses, because the type of incident has three categories, with no predetermined order or numerical meaning. The value of beta varies between 0 and 1, and its size indicates the overall differences in proportions charged among the three types of incident.

effects of the region in which the incident occurred and the age of the accused. Property incidents are more likely to occur in the Province of Quebec and York Region (Table A-7), whose low charge rates (Table 1) depress the overall charge rate for property incidents. "Other" incidents occur disproportionately in the high-charge regions of New Brunswick and Saskatchewan, which inflates the charge rate of this type of incident. Thus, the differential locations of the different types of incidents tend to inflate the differences among the proportions charged of each type of incident.

The age of the accused operates in a similar way. Property incidents are more likely to have younger accused (Table A-7), who tend to have lower charge rates (Table 4). "Other" incidents have higher proportions of older accused youth, who have higher charge rates. When these and other small spurious effects are controlled, the true differences in proportions charged between the categories of the type of incident are evident: incidents directed against property and against the person have fairly similar charge rates (55.5 and 58.7 percent respectively), but "other" incidents have a much higher charge rate (76.4 percent).

Analysis of the factors mediating between the type of incident and the proportion charged takes a rather different form from the previous analyses, because each mediating factor is unique, or almost unique, to a particular type of incident: the relationship of a victim and an accused and the level of injury to a victim are coded only for incidents directed against the person and traffic incidents, the type of weapon only for incidents directed against the person, and, necessarily, a modus operandi of shoplifting is coded only for property incidents. Thus, the large reduction in the proportion charged–from 58.7 percent to 45.9 percent--for incidents involving an offence against the person, when the existence of an identifiable victim is controlled,[28] with a concomitant *increase* in the value of beta, can be interpreted as meaning that an identifiable victim increases the likelihood of charges being laid–by approximately 13 percent. To put it differently, if incidents involving an offence against the person did *not* have an identifiable victim–like property incidents[29] and most "other" incidents–they would result in charges only 46 percent of the time instead of 59 percent. It is interesting that the level of injury to a victim adds practically nothing to the explanation of the relative probability of charges in person, property and "other" incidents: it is the existence of a victim that is important. Presumably this is because of the evidentiary importance of the victim, and also the weight attached to the wishes of the victim concerning charging.

Similarly, the presence of a weapon, the reporting of which is restricted to incidents involving offences against the person, explains an additional 7 percent of the probability of

---

[28]The same effect is obtained whether the relationship of accused and victim, or simply the presence of a victim, is controlled, since it is the latter which is salient.

[29]Many property offences could be said to have an identifiable victim, but the rules of the Revised UCR Survey prevent this from being recorded.

charges in these incidents. The cumulative effect of these factors is that incidents involving offences against the person would result in charges against only 37 percent accused youth–a much lower proportion than property and "other" incidents--if no victim or weapon were present. Of course, a victim and/or a weapon *were* present in most of these incidents, so the observed proportion of accused in such incidents who were charged, controlling for spuriousness, was 58.7 percent, a little higher than the proportion of youth implicated in property incidents.

4.8 Relationship Between An Accused and a Victim

The first row of Table 9 shows that charges are most likely to be laid against youth implicated in incidents in which all accused and victims are strangers, and least likely when an accused and a victim have a non-family relationship–friend, acquaintance, or business relationship--with incidents involving family relationships at an intermediate level.[30] This association between the victim-accused relationship and likelihood of charging is not particularly strong: the percentage differences are not great, and the summary statistic, beta, has a value of only 0.15. Nevertheless, it is worth investigating to what extent these differences represent a real influence of the relationship on charging, and to what extent they are explicable in terms of associated characteristics of the incident or accused.

[30]The "relationship between an accused and a victim" is reported in the Revised UCR Survey only for incidents involving an offence against the person. Among these accused, the baseline proportion charged is 59.5 percent (Table 1).

Table 9. The likelihood of charges by the closest accused-victim relationship*

	Non-family	Family	Stranger	Unknown	Strength of relationship	Change in beta due to this variable
	% chgd.	% chgd.	% chgd.	% chgd.	beta	
Unadjusted	54.2	62.1	70.3	66.7	0.152	
Adjusted for antecedent variables:						
Adjusted for region	54.3	61.5	69.1	70.2	0.146	0.01
Adjusted for gender of the accused	54.5	61.5	68.7	70.0	0.141	0.01
Adjusted for accused aboriginal status	54.5	61.5	68.6	70.0	0.141	0.00
Adjusted for age of the accused	55.8	61.7	67.1	68.9	0.125	0.02
Adj. for consumption of alcohol/drugs	55.9	61.7	66.8	68.9	0.121	0.00
Adjusted for co-accused adult	56.1	62.0	66.3	68.7	0.117	0.00
Adj. for number of co-accused youth	56.1	62.4	66.3	68.8	0.118	0.00
Adjusted for intervening variables:						
Adjusted for weapon	54.0	59.3	63.6	65.3	0.125	-0.01
Adjusted for injury to victim	53.7	59.6	63.3	65.4	0.134	-0.01
Adjusted for most serious violation	54.8	60.7	62.6	64.7	0.104	0.03

* for incidents involving offences against the person only

There is little spuriousness in this association, since controlling for all available antecedent variables results in adjusted percentages which are little different to the unadjusted percentages, and a value of beta–0.12–which is close to the unadjusted value. The only appreciable source of spuriousness is the age of the accused: younger accused are more likely to be implicated in incidents in which the accused and the victim have a non-family relationship,[31] and older youth are more likely to be implicated in incidents involving accused and victims who are strangers. The gender of the accused has a similar but weaker effect: females are implicated in a slightly greater proportion of incidents in which victim(s) and accused have a non-family relationship; males in incidents in which accused and victim(s) are strangers.

Thus, the actual effect of the accused-victim relationship on the likelihood of charges being laid is summarized by a beta of 0.12. This effect is mediated slightly by the presence of a weapon and injury suffered by the victim, and to a greater extent by the type of violation in the incident. Firearms are much less likely to be present in incidents involving a victim and accused who know each other, whether as family or otherwise, and firearms and other weapons are much more likely in incidents involving strangers or unknown relationships. Similarly, major injury or death are less likely in incidents involving family, and more likely when victim and accused are

[31]This clumsy formulation is necessitated by the fact that we do not know whether it is the focal accused or some other accused–possibly even an adult accused--who has the recorded relationship with the victim.

strangers. However, the main factor mediating the effect of the victim-accused relationship is the type of violation. Incidents involving strangers are more likely to be characterized by police as homicide, attempt murder, or other indictable offences, which are subject to relatively high rates of charging; whereas incidents involving victim(s) and accused in non-family relationships are more likely to be characterized as level 1 assault, which has a lower probability of resulting in charges.[32]

After controlling for all related factors, some differences remain between the proportions charged of youth implicated in incidents with different types of victim-accused relationships. In particular, a non-family victim-accused relationship is associated with a substantially lower-than-average rate of charging, even when weapon, injury, and type of violation are controlled. This may be due to unidentified factors, or it could represent a reluctance on the part of police, Crowns, or other decision-makers, or the victim, to lay charges in violence involving friends or acquaintances. This hypothesized reluctance is not apparent in the statistics for incidents involving victim and accused in the same family; this might reflect zero-tolerance policies concerning violence against women.

4.9 Type of Weapon Present

Like the accused-victim relationship, the type of weapon present at the incident is reported by the Revised UCR Survey only in incidents involving an offence against the person. The first row of Table 10 shows that young persons implicated in such incidents in which a weapon was present are much more likely to be charged than those in incidents involving no weapon. The presence of a firearm in particular further increases the likelihood of charges being laid. The strength of this relationship is indicated by the value of 0.17 of beta. Only a small part (0.03) of this relationship is due to antecedent factors, primarily the gender and age of the accused. Male and older accused youth are more likely to be implicated in incidents involving a firearm (Table A-9), which is part of the reason that incidents involving a firearm are more likely to result in charges.

[32]Level 1 sexual assault is also much more common when there is a family or non-family relationship than when victim and accused are strangers, but this cannot contribute to an explanation of differential charging of apprehended youth, because, unlike level 1 assault, this offence has an average probability (59.9 percent) of resulting in charges.

Table 10. The likelihood of charges by the presence and type of weapon*

	None or unknown % chgd.	Other weapon % chgd.	Firearm % chgd.	Strength of relationship beta	Change in beta due to this variable
Unadjusted	55.0	73.2	80.0	0.167	
Adjusted for antecedent variables:					
Adjusted for region	55.1	73.0	79.7	0.165	0.00
Adjusted for gender of the accused	55.3	72.4	78.6	0.158	0.01
Adjusted for accused aboriginal status	55.3	72.4	78.5	0.157	0.00
Adjusted for age of the accused	55.5	72.1	75.2	0.147	0.01
Adj. for consumption of alcohol or drugs	55.5	72.0	75.4	0.146	0.00
Adjusted for co-accused adult	55.6	71.7	74.4	0.142	0.00
Adjusted for number of co-accused youth	55.5	72.2	74.1	0.146	0.00
Adjusted for accused-victim relationship	55.8	71.0	74.9	0.137	0.01
Adjusted for intervening variables:					
Adjusted for injury to victim	56.0	70.1	74.9	0.129	0.01
Adjusted for most serious violation	58.5	62.4	64.6	0.037	0.09

*for incidents involving offences against the person only

Although there is, not surprisingly, some association between the presence of a weapon and the level of injury suffered by a victim, this plays only a small role in explaining the effect of weapons on the probability of charges being laid. In other words, it is only to a small degree that the presence of a weapon increases the likelihood of charges by increasing the likelihood of injury to a victim. There are three reasons for this non-effect. First, minor injury to a victim has no effect on the likelihood of charges being laid: it is only major injury or death that increases the likelihood of charges. Second, few (755 out of 13,159) "violent" incidents in which young persons were apprehended involved major injury or death of a victim. Therefore, this factor could affect the decision to charge in relatively few incidents. Third, although the presence of a *non-firearm* substantially increases the probability of major injury or death (Table A-9), the presence of a *firearm* has little effect: a firearm was present in 3.7 percent of all "violent" incidents, and 4.5 percent of incidents resulting in major injury or death.

The last row of Table 10 shows that the relationship between the presence of a weapon and the likelihood of charges being laid is almost entirely explained by the police classification of the most serious violation in the incident. Consistent with the *Criminal Code*, the presence of a weapon–whether or not a victim suffers injury--makes it extremely unlikely that the incident will be classified as involving the hybrid offences of level 1 assault or sexual assault, and extremely likely that it will be classified as level 2 assault or sexual assault (i.e. assault or sexual assault "with a weapon") or one of the other indictable offences against the person (Table A-9).

This in turn makes it very likely that charges will be laid (Table 1).

4.10 Injury to a Victim

Although injury to a victim does not contribute much to an explanation of the effect of weapons on the likelihood of charges being laid, it is still possible that in itself it affects charging. The first row of Table 11 shows that there is practically no difference in the probability of charges being laid between incidents in which a victim suffered minor injury and those in which a victim suffered no injury or an unknown level of injury; however, major injury or death is associated with a much higher probability of charges.

Table 11. The likelihood of charges by the most serious injury to a victim*

	None or unknown % charged	Minor injury % charged	Major injury or death % charged	Strength of relationship beta	Change in beta due to this variable
Unadjusted	57.9	58.2	84.0	0.121	
Adjusted for antecedent variables:					
Adjusted for region	58.0	58.4	81.2	0.107	0.01
Adj. for gender of the accused	57.8	58.8	80.7	0.105	0.00
Adj. for accused aboriginal status	57.7	58.8	80.7	0.105	0.00
Adj. for age of the accused	58.2	58.7	77.5	0.089	0.02
Adj. for consumption of alcohol/drugs	58.2	58.6	77.4	0.089	0.00
Adj. for co-accused adult	58.2	58.7	77.0	0.086	0.00
Adj. for number of co-accused youth	58.3	58.5	77.3	0.088	0.00
Adj. for accused-victim relationship	58.8	58.0	76.4	0.084	0.00
Adj. for type of weapon	58.7	58.6	73.5	0.069	0.02
Adjusted for intervening variables:					
Adj. for most serious violation	58.7	59.8	64.3	0.026	0.04

* for incidents involving offences against the person only

Controlling for various possible sources of spuriousness explains almost half of this association: it reduces the increased probability of charging of incidents involving major injury or death from about 26 percent to about 15 percent, and the value of beta from 0.12 to 0.07. There is no single large source of spurious correlation; rather it is partly due to the location of the incident–major injury or death is much more likely in Vancouver, which also has a very high charge rate–partly to the age of the accused–older youth are more likely to be implicated in incidents involving major injury or death, and older youth have higher charge rates–and partly to the presence of a weapon–although firearms are more likely to be present in incidents resulting in *no* (or unknown) injury to a victim, other weapons are much more likely in incidents resulting in

major injury or death, and the presence of these weapons increases the likelihood of charges being laid.

Most of the increased probability of charging caused by major injury or death of a victim can be explained by the classification by the police of the most serious violation in the incident. Of course, this is largely determined by the *Criminal Code*. Incidents resulting in major injury or death are classified as homicide, attempt murder, level 3 ("aggravated") assault or sexual assault, robbery, and other indictable offences against the person; whereas, those resulting in minor or no injury are classified as level 1 assault or sexual assault or other hybrid offences. Since level 1 assaults have a relatively low probability of charges, and indictable offences against the person have a relatively high probability, this explains how the level of injury to a victim affects the probability of charges being laid.

4.11 Modus Operandi is Shoplifting

This aspect of property incidents is of interest for two reasons: first, because the "victim" of shoplifting is often a corporate entity rather than a person, and second, because of the high proportion of shoplifting incidents involving female accused. The first row of Table 12 shows that young persons implicated in property incidents in which the M.O. was shoplifting were more likely than average to be charged, and those in non-shoplifting incidents were slightly less likely than average to be charged (the relevant baseline average proportion charged is that for property incidents, 54.3 percent; Table 1). Thus, shoplifting appears to have a small aggravating effect on the probability of charges being laid. However, the introduction of controls for associated variables produces some interesting results.

Controlling for the location of the incident reduces the difference in proportion charged between shoplifting and non-shoplifting incidents to nothing. In other words, the observed difference in proportion charged was not due to whether the incident involved shoplifting, but to the uneven distribution of young persons apprehended for shoplifting incidents in high- and low-charging jurisdictions.[33] Young persons are much less likely to be apprehended for shoplifting in the low-charge jurisdictions in the Province of Quebec and York Region in Ontario, and much more likely in the relatively high-charge jurisdictions in New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, and Vancouver (Tables 1 and A-11). By controlling for the region–i.e., statistically simulating a situation in which shoplifters are distributed evenly across all jurisdictions–we eradicate the spurious correlation between shoplifting and the likelihood of charges being laid.

Table 12. The likelihood of charges by the modus operandi is shoplifting*

	Not	Shoplifting	Difference	Due to this

[33]This distribution may reflect enforcement practices as well as the actual distribution of shoplifting incidents involving young persons.

	shoplifting % charged	% charged	% charged	variable
Unadjusted	53.1	59.5	6.4	
Adjusted for antecedent variables:				
Adjusted for region	54.2	54.5	0.2	6.2
Adjusted for gender of the accused	53.9	55.9	1.9	-1.7
Adjusted for accused aboriginal status	53.8	56.3	2.5	-0.5
Adjusted for age of the accused	53.3	58.6	5.3	-2.8
Adjusted for co-accused adult	53.2	59.2	6.0	-0.7
Adjusted for number of co-accused youth	53.3	58.7	5.3	0.7
Adjusted for intervening variables:				
Adjusted for value of property involved	52.5	62.3	9.8	-4.4
Adjusted for most serious violation	51.9	65.2	13.3	-3.5

* for incidents involving offences against property only

However, further controls for spuriousness produce more changes. Controlling for the gender of the young accused *increases* the difference in proportion charged by 1.7 percent, and controlling for the aboriginal status and age of the accused, and the presence of a co-accused adult and co-accused youth result in a difference of 5.3 percent–almost as large as the unadjusted difference (Table 12). All of these variables except the number of co-accused youth are *suppressors*: that is, their associations with shoplifting incidents tend to conceal the true relationship between shoplifting and the likelihood of charges being laid. The age of the accused has the strongest suppressor effect. and the gender of the accused also plays a substantial role. Twelve- and thirteen-year-olds are much more likely to be implicated in shoplifting (Table A-11), but accused in these age groups are much less likely to be charged–regardless of their alleged offence (see above). The mitigating effect of age offsets the aggravating effect of the shoplifting. Similarly, shoplifting is much more common among female than male accused youth (Table A-11), but females are a little less likely to be charged. By controlling for age and gender, we simulate a situation in which shoplifting is distributed evenly across both genders and all age groups, and the hitherto concealed differential in charge rates appears. Similarly, shoplifting is slightly more common among non-aboriginal accused youth, but non-aboriginals have lower charge rates; and it is much more common among accused youth who do not have a co-accused adult, and this group also has lower charge rates. All four of these characteristics–being younger, females, non-aboriginal, and lacking a co-accused adult, are associated with shoplifting and with a lower likelihood of charging. Thus, the 5.3 percent higher probability of being charged that is actually associated with shoplifting incidents is hidden.

To what extent is this aggravating effect of shoplifting mediated by other circumstances of the incident? The only relevant circumstances that are captured for property incidents are the value of property stolen or damaged, and the characterization by police of the most serious

violation.[34] Neither of these explains the effect of shoplifting on the likelihood of charges being laid; in fact, both are substantial suppressors. Shoplifting incidents in which young persons are implicated are much more likely to involve property valued at less than $100, and practically never involve property worth more than $500 (Table A-11); this *reduces* the likelihood that the shoplifting incident will result in charges. Similarly, shoplifting incidents are very likely to be characterized as theft under--an offence which has a relatively low likelihood of charges–which further reduces the proportion of youth apprehended for shoplifting who are charged.[35]

When these two mediating circumstances of the incident are controlled, the adjusted difference in proportion charged between young persons implicated in shoplifting and non-shoplifting incidents rises to 13.3 percent. This means that the fact that the incident involves shoplifting in itself increases the likelihood of charges by 13.3 percent; but the fact that shoplifting incidents tend to involve property of low value and to be characterized as theft under reduces the increase in charge rate of shoplifting incidents to 5.3 percent.

4.12 Value of Property Stolen, Damaged, Fraudulently Obtained, or of Illicit Drugs

The first row of Table 13 shows the proportion charged of young persons implicated in incidents involving property classified into 5 categories of value. This analysis is restricted to the 66,136 incidents in which the value of property was reported, mainly property incidents, but also some incidents involving offences against the person and "other" offences (Table A-12). There is only a weak relationship between the likelihood of charges being laid and the value of property involved in the incident: the percentages charged for all five categories of property value do not differ greatly, and the value of the summary statistic beta is only 0.08. As one would expect, the likelihood of charges rises with the value of property, except for two puzzling drops in percentage charged, in the $100 to $499 and $500 to $999 categories. This is explored below.

The location of the incident has a small suppressor effect, since controlling for the region increases the relationship between value of property and likelihood of charges to a value of 0.10 for beta–and smooths the anomalous percentages charged for the $100 to $999 range (Table 13). This is because incidents in the lower-charging jurisdictions of Quebec and York Region tend to have higher property values, and incidents in the higher-charging regions of New Brunswick, Saskatchewan and Vancouver tend to have lower-valued property involved (Table A-12).

---

[34]Other circumstances are captured by the Survey, but are either unusable due to data quality or not relevant.

[35]Shoplifting incidents also have a higher-than-average likelihood of being characterized by the offence of possess stolen property, which has a high likelihood of resulting in charges, but there are far fewer of these incidents than of incidents characterized as theft under.

Table 13. The likelihood of charges by the value of property involved*

	$0 - $25 % chgd	$26 - $99 % chgd	$100 - $499 % chgd	$500 - $999 % chgd	$1,000 or more % chgd	Strength of relationship beta	Due to this variable
Unadjusted	52.2	55.6	52.6	47.2	60.4	0.078	
Adjusted for antecedent variables:							
Adjusted for region	48.3	53.9	53.8	50.3	63.1	0.103	-0.03
Adjusted for gender of the accused	48.4	54.1	53.8	50.2	63.0	0.102	0.00
Adjusted for accused aboriginal status	48.6	54.2	53.8	50.1	62.8	0.100	0.00
Adjusted for age of the accused	50.3	55.2	53.6	49.3	60.6	0.078	0.02
Adjusted for co-accused adult	50.5	55.5	53.7	49.1	60.2	0.075	0.00
Adjusted for number of co-accused youth	50.3	55.1	53.4	50.0	60.6	0.076	0.00
Adjusted for type of incident	49.7	55.0	53.3	50.5	61.3	0.083	-0.01
Adjusted for M.O. is shoplifting	48.6	53.2	53.9	51.7	62.5	0.096	-0.01
Adjusted for intervening variables:							
Adjusted for most serious violation	48.9	53.5	54.9	53.3	59.6	0.073	0.02

*for incidents involving property only

The age of the accused partly explains the relationship between value of property involved and the likelihood of charging (Table 13): younger accused youth tend to be implicated in incidents involving lower-valued property, and older youth tend to be involved with higher-valued property (Table A-12).

The type of incident has a slight offsetting effect on the association between the value of property and the likelihood of charges: when it is controlled, the value of beta increases slightly, and the anomalous percentages for the $100 to $999 range are improved slightly (Table 13). This is because the type of incident with the highest charge rates–"other" incidents–tend to involve property with the lowest values (Table A-12), and incidents with the lowest charge rates–property incidents–involve property with the highest values. Although the differences among the three types of incidents in value of property involved are large, the overall offsetting effect on the association between property value and charging is only slight, because the numbers of person and "other" incidents are so small compared to the number of property incidents. Similarly, whether or not the modus operandi is shoplifting tends to offset the association of property value and charging (Table 13), since shoplifting in itself tends to increase the likelihood of charges, but shoplifting incidents tend to involve property of little value (Table A-12).

When the effects of these and other, less important sources of spuriousness are controlled, the relationship between the value of property involved and the likelihood of charges being laid rises to a beta value of 0.10, and the anomalous drop in the percentages charged for the $100 to $999 range is almost eliminated. A pattern emerges of a somewhat lower rate of charging for incidents involving property valued at $25 or less, a higher rate for property valued at $1,000 or more, and an intermediate level of charging for incidents involving property with value between

these extremes. This shows the effect of the value of property involved on the likelihood that the young accused will be charged.

By controlling for the most serious violation, we can see through what mechanism the value of property affects the likelihood of charging. This phenomenon is almost entirely within the category of property offences, since they make up the great majority of incidents analysed here. Incidents involving property with low value tend to be classified as theft under (Table A-12), which is subject to a relatively low rate of charging (Table 1).[36] Incidents involving property with a higher value tend to be classified as break and enter, theft over, and other indictable property offences (Table A-12), which have a relatively high rate of charging. This explanation parallels that for the presence of a weapon and injury to a victim in incidents involving offences against the person: incidents causing greater actual or potential harm–whether personal or financial–tend to be classified as indictable (versus summary or hybrid) offences, which have a much higher likelihood of resulting in charges.

The interesting exception to this pattern is the intermediate value of property involved in the numerous incidents of mischief: these are more likely to involve property valued at $100 to $999 (Table A-12). Since mischief has a very low charge rate (40 percent of youth implicated in incidents of mischief were charged; Table 1), this depresses the charge rate for these two categories of property value, and provides the main explanation for their anomalously low overall proportions charged.

4.13 The Most Serious Violation in the Incident

The classification of the incident as to the most serious violation that occurred has already played a large role in previous discussions of the effects of other characteristics of the accused and of the incident on the likelihood of charges being laid. However, the most serious violation has always figured as a mediating variable: the classification of the incident has been analysed as one of the mechanisms through which other factors affect the decision to charge. For example, one of the reasons that incidents involving major injury, the presence of a weapon, or major financial loss are more likely to result in charges is that they tend to be classified as involving indictable offences, which are less likely to be dealt with informally.

We now address the issue of the effect on charging of the classification of the incident itself. In other words, to what extent are the relatively high charge rates of youth implicated in incidents classified as, for example, possess stolen property, break and enter, traffic, and morals, due to the circumstances of the incident or to characteristics of the accused, and to what extent are they due to the classification of the offence itself, independent of other factors? Similarly, to what extent is the low likelihood of charges in incidents of theft under, mischief and level 1

[36]And as fraud and possess stolen property, but there are relatively few of these incidents, compared to the numerous incidents of theft under.

assault due to the minor harm caused by these incidents, or the types of youth implicated in them, and to what extent is it due to the nature of the offences themselves?

We can attempt an answer to this question by examining the relationship between the classification of the incident and the likelihood of charges, while controlling other aspects of the incident that might explain their association. Since certain circumstances are only applicable to, or are only captured for, certain types of incidents, the analysis is done separately for each of the three types of incidents–against the person, property, and other. The relationship between the likelihood of charges and the most serious violation in the incident is, not surprisingly, quite strong in all three types of incidents: with the value of the summary statistic beta ranging from 0.26 for property incidents and 0.27 for incidents against the person to 0.43 for "other" incidents.

Table 14. The likelihood of charges by the most serious violation: person offences

	Homicide, attempt % chgd	Other indictable person % chgd	Level 1 sexual assault % chgd	Level 1 assault % chgd	Strength of relationship (beta)	Change in beta due to this variable
Unadjusted	96.4	75.8	59.9	48.4	0.269	
Adjusted for antecedent variables:						
Adjusted for region	98.1	75.2	59.6	48.7	0.261	0.01
Adjusted for gender of the accused	97.6	74.9	58.6	49.1	0.255	0.01
Adjusted for accused aboriginal status	97.4	74.9	58.5	49.1	0.254	0.00
Adjusted for age of the accused	93.5	73.9	61.3	49.5	0.240	0.01
Adj. for consumption of alcohol/drugs	92.6	73.8	61.5	49.5	0.239	0.00
Adjusted for co-accused adult	92.5	73.7	61.5	49.5	0.238	0.00
Adj. for number of co-accused youth	91.8	74.1	61.3	49.3	0.243	-0.01
Adj. for victim-accused relationship	90.6	73.3	61.5	49.9	0.230	0.01
Adjusted for type of weapon	87.4	72.1	62.4	50.6	0.212	0.02
Adjusted for injury to victim	83.9	71.6	63.2	50.8	0.204	0.01

The first row of Table 14 shows the unadjusted relationship between the type of violation against the person and the proportion of accused youth who were charged, compared with a baseline proportion charged for incidents against the person of 59.5 percent (Table 1). Almost all young persons implicated in incidents of homicide or attempt murder were charged, as were a substantial proportion of those implicated in other indictable offences, mainly robbery and level 2 (with a weapon) and 3 (aggravated) assault. Young persons implicated in incidents of level 1 sexual assault were charged in average proportions, and those implicated in level 1 assault in below-average proportions. Evidently, the likelihood of charges is related to the relative seriousness of the most serious violation.

There are some associations between characteristics of the accused, circumstances of the incident, and the characterization as to most serious violation in incidents directed against the person (Table A-13). The types of offences are not distributed equally across the grouped jurisdictions, male accused are over-represented in all offence groups other than level 1 assault, and so on. However, none of these associations alone explains much of the relationship between the type of violation and the likelihood of charges (Table 14). The most important antecedent factor is the type of weapon present in the incident: the presence of a firearm or other weapon clearly differentiates incidents classified as indictable versus hybrid, and this in turn has a strong effect on the likelihood of charging in the incident. Major injury to a victim plays a similar role. However, even these two mediating factors explain only a little of the decision to charge (0.03 of the beta of 0.27). Therefore, even after controlling for all available possible spurious variables, we are left with a fairly strong relationship (beta equals 0.20), suggesting that it is the type of violation itself, regardless of offender or incident characteristics, that has a strong influence on the decision to charge.

Table 15. The likelihood of charges by the most serious violation: property offences

	Possess stolen property	Fraud	Break and enter	Other indict-able	Theft under	Mis-chief	Strength of relation-ship beta	Change in beta due to this variable
	% chgd	% chgd	% chgd	% chgd	% chgd	% chgd		
Unadjusted	87.3	69.9	63.3	58.9	39.8	45.3	0.261	
Adjusted for antecedent variables:								
Adjusted for region	85.6	67.4	65.4	59.7	40.1	44.0	0.269	-0.01
Adjusted for gender of the accused	85.7	67.6	65.3	59.6	40.0	44.2	0.268	0.00
Adjusted for accused aboriginal status	85.5	68.1	64.9	59.5	40.1	44.4	0.264	0.00
Adjusted for age of the accused	84.4	64.1	64.0	57.9	43.2	44.8	0.243	0.02
Adjusted for co-accused adult	84.5	64.2	63.7	57.9	43.4	44.9	0.240	0.00
Adj. for number of co-accused youth	84.3	63.8	63.7	58.0	43.7	44.8	0.239	0.00
Adjusted for M.O. is shoplifting	83.2	66.8	65.3	59.6	45.8	42.6	0.255	-0.02
Adjusted for value of property	86.9	67.7	64.8	56.2	45.2	43.4	0.260	-0.01

Similar conclusions can be drawn about incidents involving offences against property (Table 15) and "other" incidents (Table 16). Although types of property incidents vary considerably by region, gender, aboriginal status, and age of the accused youth, presence of a co-accused adult or youth, the modus operandi, and the value of goods involved (Table A-14), none of these factors explains much the relationship between the type of property incident and the likelihood of charges being laid. Younger youth, who are less likely to be charged, are more likely to be implicated in incidents of mischief and theft under, and this partly explains the low charge rates of these offences. On the other hand, incidents involving theft under would have somewhat *lower* charge rate than they do, were it not for the large number of these incidents that also involved shoplifting, which increases the likelihood of charges. However, the net effect of these adjustments for explanatory factors is to leave unexplained a strong relationship between the type of violation and the proportion of young accused who were charged.

Table 16. The likelihood of charges by the most serious violation: other offences

	Admin of justice	Indict-able drug	Traffic	Morals	Weap-ons	Sum-mary/ hybrid drug	Misc.	Strength of relation-ship	Change in beta due to this variable
	% chgd	% chgd	% chgd	% chgd	% chgd	% chgd	% chgd	beta	
Unadjusted	94.7	78.8	84.4	83.1	69.7	66.0	51.2	0.426	
Adjusted for antecedent variables:									
Adjusted for region	93.5	84.3	85.3	76.5	67.6	69.2	52.0	0.405	0.02
Adjusted for gender of the accused	93.4	84.3	85.0	77.9	67.1	69.2	52.4	0.401	0.00
Adjusted for accused aboriginal status	93.4	84.4	84.9	77.8	67.1	69.3	52.4	0.401	0.00
Adjusted for age of the accused	93.3	84.5	83.1	76.9	68.3	69.1	53.4	0.390	0.01
Adj. for consumption of alcohol/drugs	93.3	84.5	83.1	76.9	68.3	69.1	53.4	0.390	0.00
Adjusted for co-accused adult	93.6	83.5	83.3	76.7	68.2	68.8	53.0	0.396	-0.01
Adj. for number of co-accused youth	93.0	84.4	82.7	76.6	69.9	69.2	54.2	0.377	0.02
Adjusted for value of property	92.9	84.7	82.9	76.7	69.5	69.4	54.1	0.379	0.00

Similarly, although there are many associations among characteristics of the accused, the incident, and the type of violation in "other" incidents (Table A-15), controlling for these potentially explanatory factors has little impact on the very large differences in charge rates among the types of "other" incidents (Table 16). "Other" incidents have a very high average probability of charges (81.7 percent, Table 1), mainly because of the very high charge rate (94.7 percent) of young accused implicated in offences against the administration of justice, who make up about half of the young accused implicated in "other" incidents. Neither the very high charge rate for these offences, nor the below average rates for weapons offences, summary and hybrid drug offences, and miscellaneous offences are explained by characteristics of the accused or circumstances of the offence.

Thus, in all three types of incidents, there appears to be a level of charging that is associated with the offence classification, rather than the type of accused youth or other circumstances of the incident.

5. Relative Impact of Factors

This section summarizes the data presented above concerning the relative impact of characteristics of the incident and the accused on the likelihood of charges being laid. "Relative impact" is difficult to assess precisely, because of the heterogeneity of these factors; nevertheless, rough comparisons can be made, and are illuminating.

Table 17. The impact of characteristics of the accused and the incident on the likelihood of charges being laid

Factor	Individual impact		Overall impact	
	Rank	Mean % difference from baseline	Rank	Beta*
High impact				
Most serious violation	1	14.8	1	0.27
Age of the accused	2	10.9	2	0.20
Type of weapon present	3	10.2	4	0.14
Moderate impact				
Consumption of alcohol or drugs	4	9.7	11	0.03
Type of incident	5	7.1	3	0.15
Victim-accused relationship	6	5.7	5	0.12
Aboriginal status of the accused	7	5.6	9	0.05
Number of co-accused youth	8	5.0	7	0.07
Value of property involved	9	3.6	6	0.10
Low impact				
Level of injury to a victim	10	3.3	8	0.07
Modus operandi is shoplifting	11	2.7	10	0.04
Co-accused adult	12	2.4	11	0.03
Gender of the accused	13	2.3	11	0.03

*Adjusted for spuriousness

The following discussion, based on Table 17, uses two indicators of impact: "individual" and "overall" impact. By "individual impact", we mean the impact of a characteristic on the likelihood of being charged for each individual accused who possesses this characteristic. This is indicated by simple differences in percentage charged between accused who have the characteristic and the baseline 59 percent charged, after adjustment for spuriousness. For example, the second line of Table 2 shows that, after adjusting for spuriousness, female accused youth are 3.8 percent less likely than average to be charged, and males are 0.7 percent more likely than average; this gives an (unweighted) mean difference from average for the two groups of 2.25 percent.[37]

By "overall impact", we mean the role that this factor plays in decisions to charge in the entire population of accused youth. This is a function both of individual impact and of the degree of variation of this characteristic in the population. For example, evidence of consumption of alcohol or drugs by the accused has a large *individual* impact on the likelihood of being charged:

[37]Calculated as (3.8 + 0.7)/2.

accused youth who were so identified were much more likely than average to be charged. However, this factor has little *overall* impact in the population, because so few accused youth were identified by police as having consumed intoxicants: thus, the factor has low salience with respect to the decision to charge in the overall population of accused youth. Overall impact is indicated by the value of beta, after adjustment for spuriousness.

We use these two indicators to group the factors analysed here into three groups: those with relatively large individual *and* overall impact; those with relatively small overall and individual impact; and those in between–having moderate overall and individual impact, or a strong impact of one type but not the other.

Among the factors analysed here, the most serious violation in the incident has by far the largest impact on the likelihood of charges being laid, both in individual cases and in the overall population, even after being adjusted for the antecedent effects of all other factors (Tables 14 to 16). This is followed by the age of the accused and the type of weapon (if any) present. Although all three of these case characteristics have a strong impact on the likelihood of charges, it can be seen from Table 17 that the overall impact of the type of weapon is only about half as great as that of the most serious violation. This is partly because the presence of a weapon was recorded in only a relatively small number of incidents: the UCR Survey records this datum only for incidents involving an offence against the person (i.e. only 14 percent of incidents in this sample), and a weapon was identified in only about one quarter of these incidents. The weapon is an important factor when one is present, but this is relatively infrequent.

Evidence of consumption of alcohol or drugs by the accused is also an important factor when it is present (i.e., recorded by police), but this was extremely rare in the present sample, so this variable has very low overall salience. This may well be more a reflection of coding practices than of reality. Similarly, aboriginal accused youth are substantially more likely to be charged, but few accused were identified as aboriginals.

The opposite phenomenon is evident for the value of property involved in the incident. The likelihood of charges being laid does not vary greatly among the categories of this variable. However, it has moderately high overall impact, because incidents in this sample varied considerably in the value of property involved: thus, it had a moderate impact in many incidents.

Other factors with moderate impact on the likelihood of charges being laid include the type of incident (whether against person, property, or neither), the relationship, if any, between an accused and a victim, and the number of co-accused youth in the incident.

Finally, four factors have only a weak impact on the decision to charge: the level of injury suffered by a victim, whether the modus operandi was shoplifting, the presence of an adult co-accused in the incident, and the gender of the accused, which has the smallest impact of all factors analysed.

6. Summary and Conclusions

This statistical analysis of factors affecting pre-charge diversion of apprehended young persons is based on data from the Revised Uniform Crime Reporting Survey. It includes characteristics of the accused and of the incident for all 94,221 young persons apprehended in 1992 and 1993 by police departments in certain towns and cities in New Brunswick, Ontario, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia, and in almost all of the Province of Quebec. The salience of the following factors was analysed: the gender, aboriginal status and age of the accused; whether the accused consumed alcohol or drugs prior to the incident; the presence of an adult co-accused and the number of co-accused youth; any relationship between an accused and a victim in the incident; the type of weapon present, if any; the level of injury suffered by the victim(s), if any; whether or not the incident involved shoplifting; the value of property involved, if any; and the characterization by police of the most serious violation (offence) in the incident. Data were not available from the UCR on the following variables, which have been found by other research to affect the decision whether to charge juvenile suspects: prior contacts of the accused with the police or the criminal history of the accused, the preference of the victim(s) concerning processing of the accused, the behaviour or "demeanour" of the accused, and the quantity and quality of the "situational evidence"–i.e., evidence which is readily available at the scene and which establishes the involvement of the accused.

As Conly (1978) noted in the 1970's, the recorded proportion of young persons apprehended by police who are charged varies greatly from jurisdiction to jurisdiction in Canada. It is difficult to determine to what extent this reflects actual differences in charging or differences in record-keeping. It is also difficult to know to what extent any actual differences in charging would reflect variations in police practices, since the Crown, screening agencies, and alternative measures programmes have different impacts on the laying of charges in different jurisdictions. Therefore, we cannot draw very precise conclusions from the large observed jurisdictional variations, other than to note that they exist, and must be "controlled" in order to avoid attributing influence to other factors which is really simply jurisdictional variation.

The characteristics of the accused youth reported by the Revised UCR Survey all have some effect on the likelihood of charges being laid. Male accused youth are slightly (4.5 percent) more likely than females to be charged, partly because male accused youth are on average a little older than females, and older accused are more likely to be charged. The offence profiles of male and female accused youth are different, but the influences of these differences on the likelihood of charging tend to cancel each other out. We are left with an unexplained difference of 4.0 percent of the difference in likelihood of charging between male and female accused youth; this may be due to gender discrimination or to other factors, such as demeanour, which were not included in the analysis.

There is a strong relationship between the age of the accused youth and the likelihood of

being charged, which rises from 34 percent for 12-year-olds to 68 percent for 17-year-olds. After adjusting for confounding effects, the (weighted) average increase in proportion charged per year of age is 6.6 percent. Part of this increase with age is due to a concomitant increase in the likelihood of an adult co-accused, a decrease in the number of co-accused youth, the changing profile of the accused-victim relationship, the increasing value of property involved, and the increasing seriousness of the type of offence–all of which tend to increase the likelihood of charging. However, 4.6 percent out of the 6.6 percent increase per year of age in the likelihood of charging could not be explained by other factors, and may represent differential treatment of older youth, or unanalysed factors such as demeanour or prior police contacts or criminal history, which could reasonably be expected to become more serious with age.

Although very few of the sample of apprehended youth were identified by police as aboriginals, these young persons were charged in much higher than average proportions (84 percent, versus 58 percent for non-aboriginals). Half of this difference of 26 percent is due to the concentration of aboriginal accused youth in relatively high-charge jurisdictions. Very little of the remaining difference in proportion charged of 11 percent between aboriginal and non-aboriginal youth can be attributed to differential case characteristics, and may therefore be due to bias related to aboriginal status itself, or to other mediating factors which are not available in the UCR data.

The circumstances of the incident have some effect on the likelihood of charges being laid. Evidence of consumption of alcohol or drugs by the accused youth–though rarely reported in the UCR Survey–increases the likelihood of charges by 19 percent, when the effect of confounding factors is removed. Most of this effect is not mediated by other identified aspects of the incident, such as injury to the victim or the most serious violation. Therefore, it may be due to the effect of intoxication itself–for example, on the "demeanour" of the accused, or on the perceived necessity of making an arrest for reasons of public safety.

The presence in the incident of an adult co-accused has a weak effect: it increases the likelihood of charges by 5 percent, when the effect of spurious correlation is removed. It should be noted that many of these "adult" co-accused are only in their late teens. Although several aspects of the incident are associated with the presence of an adult co-accused, they do not explain the differential charging of young persons apprehended in such incidents. The presence and number of co-accused young persons also affects the likelihood of charging, but in the opposite direction: young persons apprehended alone are more likely to be charged, and those apprehended in incidents involving at least 3 other young persons are least likely to be charged. Part of this differential is due to the types of incidents in which lone youth and groups of youth tend to be apprehended: groups are more likely to be involved in property incidents, which have a lower charge rate, and lone youth are more likely to be implicated in "other" (neither property nor person) incidents, which have a high charge rate.

The type of incident–whether involving an offence against the person, against property, or neither–has a substantial effect on the likelihood of charges. After adjusting for spurious

effects, young persons apprehended in "other" incidents are much more likely than average (76 percent versus 59 percent) to be charged; those implicated in property incidents are a little less likely than average (56 percent), and those in incidents directed against the person have an average likelihood of being charged. The presence of an (identified) victim and of a weapon, but not the level of injury to a victim, partly explain the decision to charge youth implicated in incidents directed against the person: in other words, incidents directed against the person which do not have an identified victim and in which no weapon (other than force) is present have a relatively low (37 percent) likelihood of resulting in charges–perhaps reflecting the important role of the victim in the decision to charge.

There is a moderately strong association between the likelihood of charges and the relationship, if any, between a victim and an accused in the incident: charges are most likely when accused and victim are strangers, least likely if accused and victim have a non-family relationship, and have an intermediate likelihood when accused and victim have a family relationship. This is partly due to the types of incidents[38] involving strangers versus those in which accused know their victims: "stranger" incidents are more likely to involve the high-charge indictable offences against the person, whereas incidents involving accused and victim who are friends or acquaintances are more likely to be characterized by police as the relatively low-charge level 1 assault. However, part of the association between likelihood of charges and victim-accused relationship cannot be explained by circumstances of the incident. This may be due to reluctance to proceed formally in incidents involving an accused youth and victim who are friends or acquaintances.

The presence of a weapon in an incident directed against the person–whether the weapon was used or not–has a strong effect on the likelihood of charges being laid This is largely because the presence of a weapon invariably results in the offence being classified as one of the indictable offences against the person, which have relatively high charge rates, rather than the hybrid offences of level 1 assault or sexual assault. However, the presence of a weapon was relatively rare in this sample of incidents involving accused youth, so this factor has less overall salience than its impact in individual cases would suggest.

Although minor injury to a victim has no effect on the likelihood of charges, the relatively rare occurrences of major injury or death increase the likelihood of charges by about 15 percent, after sources of spuriousness are controlled. As with the presence of a weapon, this differential is largely explained by the effect of major injury or death on the classification of the incident as involving an indictable offence.

Among young persons implicated in property incidents, those apprehended for shoplifting have a 5 percent higher chance of being charged, after various sources of spuriousness are

---

[38]This analysis is restricted to incidents involving offences against the person, since information about a victim is reported in the UCR Survey only for these incidents.

controlled. The differential is not explained by other aspects of the incident; rather, it is suppressed by them. Shoplifting tends to involve property of relatively low value, and to be characterized by police as theft under. Both of these aspects of shoplifting reduce the likelihood of the young person apprehended for shoplifting being charged. When these "suppressor" effects are controlled–that is, when the effect of shoplifting in itself is assessed, apart from the value of the property and the police characterization of the incident–being implicated in shoplifting causes an increase of 15 percent in the likelihood of being charged.

The value of property involved in the incident–whether stolen, obtained fraudulently, damaged, or the value of illicit drugs–has a moderate effect on the likelihood of charges. Young persons implicated in incidents involving property valued at $25 or less are less likely to be charged; whereas property valued at more than $1,000 increases the likelihood of charges. This is largely because theft under has a lower charge rate; whereas offences which tend to involve higher-valued property, such as break and enter, theft over, and other indictable property offences, have a higher likelihood of charges. An interesting exception is the offence of mischief, which tends to involve property damage estimated to be in the range of $100 to $999 but has a very low charge rate.

The likelihood of charges being laid is very strongly associated with the classification of the incident by the police as to the "most serious violation". This factor has more impact than any other. This impact is not explained by the characteristics of young persons involved in different types of incidents, nor by the circumstances of the incidents. This suggests that there is a characteristic level of charging associated with different types of offences, which is largely independent of the offender or the circumstances of the incident. This finding corresponds to the importance of the "legal seriousness" of the offence which has been noted by other researchers, but to some extent it redefines "seriousness", since several of the offences which attract the highest proportions of charges are not offences which are usually considered the most serious.

Statistical research such as the present study is inherently limited by its sources of data and its mechanistic approach. It is able to estimate the relative strengths of the effects of different factors, to delineate causal mechanisms, and to point to apparent anomalies. However, it cannot describe the social processes that produce these phenomena. Several of the issues which have been raised but not resolved by this report would best be addressed by field research involving interviews with police officers and other decision-makers, and analysis of documentary evidence such as policy and training manuals.

Bibliography

Black, Donald J. and Albert J. Reiss, Jr. 1970. "Police control of juveniles'" *American Sociological Review 35*: 63-77.

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. 1994a. Uniform Crime Reporting Manual: Incident-Based Survey. Unpublished.

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. 1994b. *Canadian Crime Statistics. 1993.* Catalogue No. 85-205. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada.

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. 1996. *Canadian Crime Statistics. 1995.* Catalogue No. 85-205-XPB. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada.

Carrington, Peter J. 1996. *Age and Youth Crime in Canada.* Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada. Working Document No. WD-1996-1e.

Carrington, Peter J. and Sharon Moyer. 1994. "Trends in youth crime and police response, pre- and post-YOA." *Canadian Journal of Criminology 36*: 1-28.

Conly, D. 1978. *Patterns of Delinquency and Police Action in the Major Metropolitan Areas of Canada During the Month of December, 1976.* Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada.

Doob, Anthony N. and Janet B. L. Chan. 1982. "Factors affecting police decisions to take juveniles to court." *Canadian Journal of Criminology 24*: 25-37.

Ericson, Richard. 1981. *Making Crime.* Toronto: Butterworths.

Ericson, Richard. 1982. *Reproducing Order: A Study of Police Patrol Work.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Federal-Provincial-Territorial Task Force on Youth Justice. 1996. *A Review of the Young Offenders Act and the Youth Justice system in Canada.* Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.

Fisher, C. J. and R. I. Mawby. 1982. "Juvenile delinquency and police discretion in an inner-city area." *British Journal of Criminology 22:* 63-75.

Hackler, Jim and Wasanti Paranjape. 1983. "Juvenile justice statistics: Mythmaking or measure of system response?" *Canadian Journal of Criminology 25*: 209-226.

Kennedy, Leslie W. and David Veitch. 1997. "Why are crime rates going down? A case study in Edmonton." *Canadian Journal of Criminology 39*: 51-69.

Hornick, Joseph P. et al. 1996. *A Police Reference Manual on Crime Prevention and Diversion with Youth.* Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada.

Kong, Rebecca. 1997. *Canadian Crime Statistics 1996.* Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada.

Krohn, Melvin D,. James P. Curry and Shirley Nelson-Kilger. 1983. "Is chivalry dead? An analysis of changes in police dispositions of males and females." *Criminology 21:* 417-437.

Landau, Simha F. 1981. "Juveniles and the police." *British Journal of Criminology 21:* 27-46.

Landau, Simha F. and Gad Nathan. 1983. "Selecting delinquents for cautioning in the London Metropolitan area." *British Journal of Criminology 23:* 128-149.

Lundman, Richard J., Richard E. Sykes, and John P. Clark. 1978. "Police control of juveniles. A replication." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency:* 74-91.

Pratt, John. 1986. "Diversion from the juvenile court." *British Journal of Criminology 26:* 212-233.

Appendix A

Supporting Tables

Table A-1 Gender of the accused youth by other characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident

	Female	Male	Total	
	%	%	N	%
Total	15.3	84.7	94221	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)				
New Brunswick	17.6	82.4	1135	1.2
Montreal	13.1	86.9	22486	23.9
other Quebec	8.3	91.7	29098	30.9
York Region	9.8	90.2	9937	10.5
other Ontario	21.9	78.1	13204	14.0
Saskatchewan	28.3	71.7	14301	15.2
Vancouver	23.3	76.7	4060	4.3
Aboriginal status of the accused				
Not an aboriginal	14.9	85.1	89045	94.5
Aboriginal	22.0	78.0	5176	5.5
Age of the accused				
12	19.7	80.3	4731	5.0
13	22.5	77.5	8713	9.2
14	19.4	80.6	15325	16.3
15	16.0	84.0	19514	20.7
16	12.7	87.3	22578	24.0
17	11.1	88.9	23360	24.8
Evidence that the accused consumed alcohol or drugs				
No	15.3	84.7	93809	99.6
Yes	21.8	78.2	412	0.4
Co-accused adult in the incident				
No	16.0	84.0	82242	87.3
Yes	10.9	89.1	11979	12.7
Number of young persons implicated				
Only the accused	16.5	83.5	50035	53.1
1 or 2 co-accused youth	15.0	85.0	36069	38.3
3 or more co-accused youth	9.6	90.4	8117	8.6
Type of incident				
Against the person	18.8	81.2	13159	14.0
Against property	13.7	86.3	67296	71.4
Other	19.9	80.1	13766	14.6
Closest victim-accused relationship				
N/A	14.8	85.2	82304	87.4

	Female %	Male %	Total N	%
Stranger	14.2	85.8	3374	3.6
Unknown	14.7	85.3	892	0.9
Family	19.0	81.0	1164	1.2
Other	22.0	78.0	6487	6.9
Type of weapon present				
N/A	14.8	85.2	82034	87.1
Unknown or none	21.5	78.5	9139	9.7
Other weapon	10.8	89.2	2564	2.7
Firearm	3.7	96.3	484	0.5
Modus operandi was shoplifting				
No	10.8	89.2	82041	87.1
Yes	45.6	54.4	12180	12.9
Level of injury suffered by any victim				
N/A	14.8	85.2	81009	86.0
Unknown or none	16.2	83.8	6886	7.3
Minor injury or death	22.4	77.6	5571	5.9
Major injury or death	14.7	85.3	755	0.8
Value of property involved				
N/A	18.6	81.4	28085	29.8
0- $25	21.7	78.3	16837	17.9
$26 - 99	25.0	75.0	10321	11.0
$100-499	10.7	89.3	17987	19.1
$500-999	5.7	94.3	7567	8.0
$1,000 +	4.7	95.3	13424	14.2
Most serious violation				
Against the person	18.8	81.2	13159	14.0
Homicide, attempt murder	9.5	90.5	84	0.1
Other indictable person	12.9	87.1	4788	5.1
Sexual assault level 1	2.8	97.2	927	1.0
Assault level 1	24.7	75.3	7360	7.8
Against property	13.7	86.3	67296	71.4
Possess stolen property	22.3	77.7	4803	5.1
Fraud	26.8	73.3	1660	1.8
Break and enter	4.6	95.4	17301	18.4
Other indictable property	5.5	94.6	7580	8.0
Theft under	22.4	77.6	26494	28.1
Mischief	6.0	94.0	9458	10.0

	Female	Male	Total	
	%	%	N	%
Other	19.9	80.1	13766	14.6
Administration of justice	21.1	78.9	7333	7.8
Traffic	9.8	90.2	1053	1.1
Morals	59.8	40.2	261	0.3
Indictable drug	12.5	87.5	966	1.0
Weapons	6.7	93.3	715	0.8
Summary/hybrid drug	13.1	86.9	1174	1.2
Miscellaneous	27.1	72.9	2264	2.4

Table A-2 Aboriginal status of the accused youth by other characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident

	Aboriginal	Non-aboriginal	Total	
	%	%	N	%
Total	5.5	94.5	94221	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)				
New Brunswick	5.6	94.4	1135	1.2
Montreal	0.2	99.8	22486	23.9
other Quebec	3.6	96.4	29098	30.9
York Region	0.0	100.0	9937	10.5
other Ontario	0.3	99.7	13204	14.0
Saskatchewan	22.8	77.2	14301	15.2
Vancouver	17.9	82.1	4060	4.3
Gender of the accused				
Female	5.1	94.9	14431	15.3
Male	7.9	92.1	79790	84.7
Age of the accused				
12	7.4	92.6	4731	5.0
13	6.3	93.7	8713	9.2
14	5.7	94.3	15325	16.3
15	5.6	94.4	19514	20.7
16	5.1	94.9	22578	24.0
17	4.9	95.1	23360	24.8
Evidence that the accused consumed alcohol or drugs				
No	5.5	94.5	93809	99.6
Yes	9.7	90.3	412	0.4
Co-accused adult in the incident				
No	5.2	94.8	82242	87.3
Yes	7.5	92.5	11979	12.7
Number of young persons implicated				
Only the accused	5.7	94.3	50035	53.1
1 or 2 co-accused youth	5.2	94.8	36069	38.3
3 or more co-accused youth	5.3	94.7	8117	8.6
Type of incident				
Against the person	4.7	95.3	13159	14.0
Against property	5.5	94.5	67296	71.4
Other	6.1	93.9	13766	14.6

	Aboriginal	Non-aboriginal	Total	
	%	%	N	%
Closest victim-accused relationship				
N/A	5.6	94.4	82304	87.4
Stranger	5.3	94.7	3374	3.6
Unknown	4.8	95.2	892	0.9
Family	5.2	94.8	1164	1.2
Other	4.6	95.4	6487	6.9
Type of weapon present				
N/A	5.6	94.4	82034	87.1
Unknown or none	4.7	95.3	9139	9.7
Other weapon	5.1	94.9	2564	2.7
Firearm	7.0	93.0	484	0.5
Modus operandi was shoplifting				
No	5.4	94.6	82041	87.1
Yes	6.0	94.0	12180	12.9
Level of injury suffered by any victim				
N/A	5.6	94.4	81009	86.0
Unknown or none	5.0	95.0	6886	7.3
Minor injury or death	4.1	95.9	5571	5.9
Major injury or death	6.8	93.2	755	0.8
Value of property involved				
N/A	6.7	93.3	28085	29.8
0- $25	5.4	94.6	16837	17.9
$26 - 99	5.4	94.6	10321	11.0
$100-499	4.7	95.3	17987	19.1
$500-999	4.2	95.8	7567	8.0
$1,000 +	5.0	95.0	13424	14.2
Most serious violation				
Against the person	4.7	95.3	13159	14.0
Homicide, attempt murder	7.1	92.9	84	0.1
Other indictable person	5.7	94.3	4788	5.1
Sexual assault level 1	5.4	94.6	927	1.0
Assault level 1	3.9	96.1	7360	7.8

	Aboriginal	Non-aboriginal	Total	
	%	%	N	%
Against property	5.5	94.5	67296	71.4
Possess stolen property	9.1	90.9	4803	5.1
Fraud	2.9	97.1	1660	1.8
Break and enter	7.8	92.2	17301	18.4
Other indictable property	5.0	95.0	7580	8.0
Theft under	4.4	95.6	26494	28.1
Mischief	3.7	96.3	9458	10.0
Other	6.1	93.9	13766	14.6
Administration of justice	7.4	92.6	7333	7.8
Traffic	7.2	92.8	1053	1.1
Morals	11.5	88.5	261	0.3
Indictable drug	3.1	96.9	966	1.0
Weapons	4.1	95.9	715	0.8
Summary/hybrid drug	3.3	96.7	1174	1.2
Miscellaneous	3.8	96.2	2264	2.4

Table A-3 Age of the accused youth by other characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident

Age of the accused youth	12	13	14	15	16	17	Mean	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	age	N	%
Total	5.0	9.2	16.3	20.7	24.0	24.8	15.2	94221	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)									
New Brunswick	4.9	11.5	13.0	23.3	24.1	23.0	15.2	1135	1.2
Montreal	5.2	8.5	14.3	21.5	24.4	26.2	15.3	22486	23.9
other Quebec	5.0	9.1	15.5	19.4	24.7	26.3	15.3	29098	30.9
York Region	1.6	5.0	17.6	22.5	27.2	26.1	15.5	9937	10.5
other Ontario	6.1	11.2	18.9	20.8	21.7	21.4	15.1	13204	14.0
Saskatchewan	6.5	11.5	17.9	20.8	21.5	21.7	15.0	14301	15.2
Vancouver	4.4	9.6	16.1	20.1	24.2	25.5	15.3	4060	4.3
Gender of the accused									
Female	6.5	13.6	20.6	21.7	19.8	17.9	14.9	14431	15.3
Male	4.8	8.5	15.5	20.5	24.7	26.0	15.3	79790	84.7
Aboriginal status of the accused									
Not an aboriginal	4.9	9.2	16.2	20.7	24.1	24.9	15.2	89045	94.5
Aboriginal	6.8	10.5	16.8	21.3	22.3	22.3	15.1	5176	5.5
Evidence that the accused consumed alcohol or drugs									
No	5.0	9.3	16.3	20.7	24.0	24.7	15.2	93809	99.6
Yes	1.7	4.9	12.4	16.5	26.2	38.3	15.8	412	0.4
Co-accused adult in the incident									
No	5.6	10.3	17.7	21.6	22.8	22.0	15.1	82242	87.3
Yes	0.8	1.9	6.6	14.8	31.9	44.0	16.1	11979	12.7
Number of young persons implicated									
Only the accused	4.3	7.8	13.3	19.7	24.8	30.1	15.4	50035	53.1
1 or 2 co-accused youth	6.0	11.0	19.6	21.8	22.7	18.9	15.0	36069	38.3
3 or more co-accused youth	5.0	10.8	19.6	22.1	24.2	18.3	15.0	8117	8.6
Type of incident									
Against the person	5.5	10.4	17.1	20.5	22.1	24.4	15.2	13159	14.0
Against property	5.5	9.6	16.8	20.8	24.0	23.2	15.2	67296	71.4
Other	2.1	6.2	12.9	20.3	25.5	33.0	15.6	13766	14.6

Age of the accused youth	12 %	13 %	14 %	15 %	16 %	17 %	Mean age	Total N	%
Closest victim-accused relationship									
N/A	4.9	9.0	16.1	20.7	24.3	24.9	15.3	82304	87.4
Stranger	3.9	7.2	14.9	20.2	24.4	29.4	15.4	3374	3.6
Unknown	3.9	8.9	14.3	19.7	23.8	29.2	15.4	892	0.9
Family	4.0	11.8	17.8	19.8	22.6	20.2	15.2	1164	1.2
Other	7.1	12.5	19.3	20.8	20.1	24.0	14.9	6487	6.9
Type of weapon present									
N/A	4.9	9.1	16.1	20.7	24.3	24.9	15.2	82034	87.1
Unknown or none	5.8	11.3	17.9	20.5	21.2	23.3	15.1	9139	9.7
Other weapon	5.5	8.8	16.2	20.3	24.6	24.6	15.2	2564	2.7
Firearm	1.7	4.5	10.3	20.7	22.1	40.7	15.8	484	0.5
Modus operandi was shoplifting									
No	4.5	8.4	15.5	20.5	24.8	26.2	15.3	82041	87.1
Yes	8.3	15.0	21.6	22.1	18.0	15.1	14.7	12180	12.9
Level of injury suffered by any victim									
N/A	4.9	9.0	16.1	20.7	24.3	24.9	15.3	81009	86.0
Unknown or none	6.8	11.7	18.6	20.8	19.9	22.1	15.0	6886	7.3
Minor injury or death	5.1	10.6	17.2	20.1	23.1	23.8	15.2	5571	5.9
Major injury or death	1.5	3.7	11.7	20.8	26.2	36.2	15.8	755	0.8
Value of property involved									
N/A	3.7	8.2	14.9	20.6	24.1	28.5	15.4	28085	29.8
0- $25	7.7	13.7	20.0	20.3	19.8	18.5	14.9	16837	17.9
$26 - 99	6.9	12.2	19.6	20.9	20.6	19.7	15.0	10321	11.0
$100-499	5.2	9.1	16.6	21.0	25.2	22.9	15.2	17987	19.1
$500-999	4.7	7.5	14.3	20.0	26.8	26.7	15.4	7567	8.0
$1,000 +	2.8	4.8	12.5	21.3	28.3	30.3	15.6	13424	14.2
Most serious violation									
Against the person	5.5	10.4	17.1	20.5	22.1	24.4	15.2	13159	14.0
Homicide, attempt murder	1.2	2.4	6.0	23.8	34.5	32.1	15.8	84	0.1
Other indictable person	4.0	8.5	15.7	20.6	23.8	27.4	15.3	4788	5.1
Sexual assault level 1	8.7	15.0	21.1	20.2	16.4	18.6	14.8	927	1.0
Assault level 1	6.1	11.1	17.7	20.4	21.5	23.1	15.1	7360	7.8

Age of the accused youth	12	13	14	15	16	17	Mean	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	age	N	%
Against property	5.5	9.6	16.8	20.8	24.0	23.2	15.2	67296	71.4
Possess stolen property	3.5	8.5	15.9	21.5	24.8	25.9	15.3	4803	5.1
Fraud	1.4	4.7	8.5	16.9	31.3	37.2	15.8	1660	1.8
Break and enter	3.9	7.0	15.4	20.8	25.9	27.1	15.4	17301	18.4
Other indictable property	2.8	5.5	12.7	22.9	27.7	28.4	15.5	7580	8.0
Theft under	6.0	11.0	18.4	21.0	22.9	20.7	15.1	26494	28.1
Mischief	10.9	15.4	20.2	19.1	19.3	15.2	14.7	9458	10.0
Other	2.1	6.2	12.9	20.3	25.5	33.0	15.6	13766	14.6
Administration of justice	2.2	6.6	14.0	21.8	24.6	30.9	15.5	7333	7.8
Traffic	0.9	2.0	4.8	11.7	26.6	54.0	16.2	1053	1.1
Morals	0.4	5.0	12.6	16.1	27.6	38.2	15.8	261	0.3
Indictable drug	0.8	3.7	12.1	20.8	29.7	32.8	15.7	966	1.0
Weapons	3.2	7.6	16.2	22.2	26.6	24.2	15.3	715	0.8
Summary/hybrid drug	0.4	4.9	10.0	20.2	27.9	36.5	15.8	1174	1.2
Miscellaneous	3.8	8.6	13.8	19.5	24.1	30.3	15.4	2264	2.4

Table A-4 Evidence that the accused youth consumed alcohol or drugs by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident

	Evidence of consumption	No evidence	Total	
	%	%	N	%
Total	0.4	99.6	94221	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)				
New Brunswick	0.1	99.9	1135	1.2
Montreal	0.4	99.6	22486	23.9
other Quebec	0.1	99.9	29098	30.9
York Region	0.3	99.7	9937	10.5
other Ontario	0.7	99.3	13204	14.0
Saskatchewan	1.1	98.9	14301	15.2
Vancouver	0.1	99.9	4060	4.3
Gender of the accused				
Female	0.4	99.6	14431	15.3
Male	0.6	99.4	79790	84.7
Aboriginal status of the accused				
Not an aboriginal	0.4	99.6	89045	94.5
Aboriginal	0.8	99.2	5176	5.5
Age of the accused				
12	0.1	99.9	4731	5.0
13	0.2	99.8	8713	9.2
14	0.3	99.7	15325	16.3
15	0.3	99.7	19514	20.7
16	0.5	99.5	22578	24.0
17	0.7	99.3	23360	24.8
Co-accused adult in the incident				
No	0.4	99.6	82242	87.3
Yes	0.7	99.3	11979	12.7
Number of young persons implicated				
Only the accused	0.6	99.4	50035	53.1
1 or 2 co-accused youth	0.3	99.7	36069	38.3
3 or more co-accused youth	0.1	99.9	8117	8.6
Type of incident				
Against the person	3.0	97.0	13159	14.0
Against property	N/A	N/A	67296	71.4
Other	0.1	99.9	13766	14.6

	Evidence of consumption %	No evidence %	Total N	%
Closest victim-accused relationship				
Stranger	5.1	94.9	3374	3.6
Unknown	3.1	96.9	892	0.9
Family	2.9	97.1	1164	1.2
Other	2.6	97.4	6487	6.9
Type of weapon present				
N/A	0.0	100.0	82034	87.1
Unknown or none	3.2	96.8	9139	9.7
Other weapon	3.8	96.2	2564	2.7
Firearm	1.7	98.3	484	0.5
Level of injury suffered by any victim				
N/A	N/A	N/A	81009	86.0
Unknown or none	2.4	97.6	6886	7.3
Minor injury or death	3.7	96.3	5571	5.9
Major injury or death	5.2	94.8	755	0.8
Value of property involved				
N/A	1.1	98.9	28085	29.8
0- $25	0.2	99.8	16837	17.9
$26 - 99	0.1	99.9	10321	11.0
$100-499	0.1	99.9	17987	19.1
$500-999	0.1	99.9	7567	8.0
$1,000 +	0.1	99.9	13424	14.2
Most serious violation				
Against the person	3.0	97.0	13159	14.0
Homicide, attempt murder	8.3	91.7	84	0.1
Other indictable person	3.5	96.5	4788	5.1
Sexual assault level 1	1.7	98.3	927	1.0
Assault level 1	2.8	97.2	7360	7.8
Against property	N/A	N/A	67296	71.4
Possess stolen property	N/A	N/A	4803	5.1
Fraud	N/A	N/A	1660	1.8
Break and enter	N/A	N/A	17301	18.4
Other indictable property	N/A	N/A	7580	8.0
Theft under	N/A	N/A	26494	28.1
Mischief	N/A	N/A	9458	10.0

	Evidence of consumption	No evidence	Total	
	%	%	N	%
Other	2.6	97.4	13766	14.6
Administration of justice	N/A	N/A	7333	7.8
Traffic	1.4	98.6	1053	1.1
Morals	N/A	N/A	261	0.3
Indictable drug	N/A	N/A	966	1.0
Weapons	N/A	N/A	715	0.8
Summary/hybrid drug	N/A	N/A	1174	1.2
Miscellaneous	N/A	N/A	2264	2.4

Table A-5 Co-accused adult in the incident by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident

	Co-accused adult	No co-accused adult	Total	
	%	%	N	%
Total	12.7	87.3	94221	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)				
New Brunswick	8.5	91.5	1135	1.2
Montreal	13.3	86.7	22486	23.9
other Quebec	15.2	84.8	29098	30.9
York Region	13.9	86.1	9937	10.5
other Ontario	9.3	90.7	13204	14.0
Saskatchewan	9.9	90.1	14301	15.2
Vancouver	10.6	89.4	4060	4.3
Gender of the accused				
Female	9.1	90.9	14431	15.3
Male	13.4	86.6	79790	84.7
Aboriginal status of the accused				
Not an aboriginal	12.4	87.6	89045	94.5
Aboriginal	17.4	82.6	5176	5.5
Age of the accused				
12	1.9	98.1	4731	5.0
13	2.6	97.4	8713	9.2
14	5.1	94.9	15325	16.3
15	9.1	90.9	19514	20.7
16	17.0	83.0	22578	24.0
17	22.6	77.4	23360	24.8
Evidence that the accused consumed alcohol or drugs				
No	12.7	87.3	93809	99.6
Yes	19.4	80.6	412	0.4
Number of young persons implicated				
Only the accused	13.1	86.9	50035	53.1
1 or 2 co-accused youth	11.0	89.0	36069	38.3
3 or more co-accused youth	17.7	82.3	8117	8.6
Type of incident				
Against the person	10.5	89.5	13159	14.0
Against property	14.5	85.5	67296	71.4
Other	6.0	94.0	13766	14.6

	Co-accused adult %	No co-accused adult %	Total N	Total %
Closest victim-accused relationship				
N/A	13.1	86.9	82304	87.4
Stranger	18.8	81.2	3374	3.6
Unknown	14.6	85.4	892	0.9
Family	5.4	94.6	1164	1.2
Other	5.5	94.5	6487	6.9
Type of weapon present				
N/A	13.0	87.0	82034	87.1
Unknown or none	8.1	91.9	9139	9.7
Other weapon	16.5	83.5	2564	2.7
Firearm	35.1	64.9	484	0.5
Modus operandi was shoplifting				
No	13.9	86.1	82041	87.1
Yes	4.6	95.4	12180	12.9
Level of injury suffered by any victim				
N/A	13.1	86.9	81009	86.0
Unknown or none	10.2	89.8	6886	7.3
Minor injury or death	9.5	90.5	5571	5.9
Major injury or death	19.5	80.5	755	0.8
Value of property involved				
N/A	8.2	91.8	28085	29.8
0- $25	9.7	90.3	16837	17.9
$26 - 99	9.0	91.0	10321	11.0
$100-499	14.4	85.6	17987	19.1
$500-999	18.8	81.2	7567	8.0
$1,000 +	23.1	76.9	13424	14.2
Most serious violation				
Against the person	10.5	89.5	13159	14.0
Homicide, attempt murder	21.4	78.6	84	0.1
Other indictable person	18.5	81.5	4788	5.1
Sexual assault level 1	3.2	96.8	927	1.0
Assault level 1	6.0	94.0	7360	7.8

	Co-accused adult	No co-accused adult	Total	
	%	%	N	%
Against property	14.5	85.5	67296	71.4
Possess stolen property	13.6	86.4	4803	5.1
Fraud	15.5	84.5	1660	1.8
Break and enter	24.1	75.9	17301	18.4
Other indictable property	17.7	82.3	7580	8.0
Theft under	10.1	89.9	26494	28.1
Mischief	7.3	92.7	9458	10.0
Other	6.0	94.0	13766	14.6
Administration of justice	1.1	98.9	7333	7.8
Traffic	3.9	96.1	1053	1.1
Morals	12.3	87.7	261	0.3
Indictable drug	20.1	79.9	966	1.0
Weapons	8.0	92.0	715	0.8
Summary/hybrid drug	11.3	88.7	1174	1.2
Miscellaneous	12.5	87.5	2264	2.4

Table A-6 Number of co-accused young persons in the incident by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident

	Only the accused	1 or 2 co-accused youth	3 or more co-accused youth	Total	
	%	%	%	N	%
Total	53.1	38.3	8.6	94221	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)					
New Brunswick	66.0	32.7	1.3	1135	1.2
Montreal	53.4	35.8	10.8	22486	23.9
other Quebec	47.2	43.4	9.4	29098	30.9
York Region	47.6	41.9	10.4	9937	10.5
other Ontario	59.2	35.2	5.6	13204	14.0
Saskatchewan	60.1	33.6	6.3	14301	15.2
Vancouver	58.8	34.6	6.7	4060	4.3
Gender of the accused					
Female	57.2	37.4	5.4	14431	15.3
Male	52.4	38.4	9.2	79790	84.7
Aboriginal status of the accused					
Not an aboriginal	53.0	38.4	8.6	89045	94.5
Aboriginal	55.3	36.4	8.3	5176	5.5
Age of the accused					
12	45.6	45.8	8.6	4731	5.0
13	44.5	45.4	10.1	8713	9.2
14	43.4	46.2	10.4	15325	16.3
15	50.5	40.3	9.2	19514	20.7
16	55.0	36.3	8.7	22578	24.0
17	64.5	29.1	6.4	23360	24.8
Evidence that the accused consumed alcohol or drugs					
No	53.0	38.3	8.6	93809	99.6
Yes	74.8	22.8	2.4	412	0.4
Co-accused adult in the incident					
No	52.9	39	8.1	82242	87.3
Yes	54.8	33.2	12.0	11979	12.7
Type of incident					
Against the person	68.1	25.6	6.3	13159	14.0
Against property	43.3	46.3	10.4	67296	71.4
Other	86.8	11.2	2.0	13766	14.6

	Only the accused	1 or 2 co-accused youth	3 or more co-accused youth	Total	
	%	%	%	N	%
Closest victim-accused relationship					
N/A	51.0	40.1	8.9	82304	87.4
Stranger	54.3	34.7	11.0	3374	3.6
Unknown	58.1	30.9	11.0	892	0.9
Family	93.3	6.0	0.7	1164	1.2
Other	71.0	24.2	4.8	6487	6.9
Type of weapon present					
N/A	51.1	40.0	8.9	82034	87.1
Unknown or none	70.0	24.6	5.4	9139	9.7
Other weapon	59.4	30.1	10.4	2564	2.7
Firearm	45.5	43.8	10.7	484	0.5
Modus operandi was shoplifting					
No	53.3	37.1	9.5	82041	87.1
Yes	51.7	46.0	2.3	12180	12.9
Level of injury suffered by any victim					
N/A	50.6	40.4	9	81009	86.0
Unknown or none	69.6	24.5	5.9	6886	7.3
Minor injury or death	67.9	26.7	5.5	5571	5.9
Major injury or death	58.4	26.5	15.1	755	0.8
Value of property involved					
N/A	76.2	19.5	4.2	28085	29.8
0- $25	48.2	44.3	7.5	16837	17.9
$26 - 99	43.3	49.9	6.8	10321	11.0
$100-499	41.9	47.8	10.3	17987	19.1
$500-999	39.1	44.8	16.1	7567	8.0
$1,000 +	41.3	44.5	14.2	13424	14.2
Most serious violation					
Against the person	68.1	25.6	6.3	13159	14.0
Homicide, attempt murder	52.4	35.7	11.9	84	0.1
Other indictable person	54.8	34.4	10.8	4788	5.1
Sexual assault level 1	83.5	13.4	3.1	927	1.0
Assault level 1	75.1	21.3	3.6	7360	7.8

	Only the accused	1 or 2 co-accused youth	3 or more co-accused youth	Total	
	%	%	%	N	%
Against property	43.3	46.3	10.4	67296	71.4
Possess stolen property	50.1	42.2	7.7	4803	5.1
Fraud	68.3	28.5	3.3	1660	1.8
Break and enter	34.8	51.9	13.4	17301	18.4
Other indictable property	44.7	43.9	11.3	7580	8.0
Theft under	47.1	44.9	8.0	26494	28.1
Mischief	38.9	47.2	13.9	9458	10.0
Other	86.8	11.2	2.0	13766	14.6
Administration of justice	94.4	5.4	0.2	7333	7.8
Traffic	92.9	6.0	1.1	1053	1.1
Morals	93.9	6.1	0.0	261	0.3
Indictable drug	77.8	17.3	4.9	966	1.0
Weapons	68.1	25.5	6.4	715	0.8
Summary/hybrid drug	80.7	17.4	1.9	1174	1.2
Miscellaneous	71.6	22.5	5.9	2264	2.4

Table A-7 Type of incident by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident

	Property	Person	Other	Total	
	%	%	%	N	%
Total	71.4	14.0	14.6	94221	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)					
New Brunswick	67.7	14.6	17.7	1135	1.2
Montreal	68.3	22.2	9.5	22486	23.9
other Quebec	77.6	9.4	13.0	29098	30.9
York Region	83.6	8.8	7.6	9937	10.5
other Ontario	65.6	16.3	18.1	13204	14.0
Saskatchewan	63.6	9.2	27.1	14301	15.2
Vancouver	62.2	22.5	15.3	4060	4.3
Gender of the accused					
Female	63.9	17.1	19.0	14431	15.3
Male	72.8	13.4	13.8	79790	84.7
Aboriginal status of the accused					
Not an aboriginal	71.4	14.1	14.5	89045	94.5
Aboriginal	71.9	12.0	16.1	5176	5.5
Age of the accused					
12	78.5	15.3	6.2	4731	5.0
13	74.5	15.7	9.8	8713	9.2
14	73.7	14.7	11.6	15325	16.3
15	71.8	13.8	14.3	19514	20.7
16	71.6	12.9	15.5	22578	24.0
17	66.8	13.7	19.4	23360	24.8
Evidence that the accused consumed alcohol or drugs					
No	71.7	13.6	14.7	93809	99.6
Yes	N/A	96.4	3.6	412	0.4
Co-accused adult in the incident					
No	69.9	14.3	15.7	82242	87.3
Yes	81.6	11.5	6.9	11979	12.7
Number of young persons implicated					
Only the accused	58.2	17.9	23.9	50035	53.1
1 or 2 co-accused youth	86.4	9.3	4.3	36069	38.3
3 or more co-accused youth	86.4	10.1	3.4	8117	8.6

	Property %	Person %	Other %	Total N	%
Closest victim-accused relationship					
N/A	81.8	1.6	16.7	82304	87.4
Stranger	N/A	99.6	0.4	3374	3.6
Unknown	N/A	97.9	2.1	892	0.9
Family	N/A	99.9	0.1	1164	1.2
Other	N/A	99.7	0.3	6487	6.9
Type of weapon present					
N/A	82.0	1.2	16.8	82034	87.1
Unknown or none	N/A	100.0	N/A	9139	9.7
Other weapon	N/A	100.0	N/A	2564	2.7
Firearm	N/A	100.0	N/A	484	0.5
Modus operandi was shoplifting					
No	67.3	16.0	16.8	82041	87.1
Yes	99.4	0.4	0.2	12180	12.9
Level of injury suffered by any victim					
N/A	83.1	N/A	16.9	81009	86.0
Unknown or none	N/A	99.9	0.1	6886	7.3
Minor injury or death	N/A	99.6	0.4	5571	5.9
Major injury or death	N/A	96.6	3.4	755	0.8
Value of property involved					
N/A	15.2	36.8	48.0	28085	29.8
0- $25	92.7	6.3	1.0	16837	17.9
$26 - 99	95.6	4.2	0.2	10321	11.0
$100-499	94.4	5.3	0.3	17987	19.1
$500-999	97.7	2.2	0.2	7567	8.0
$1,000 +	98.3	1.6	0.2	13424	14.2

Table A-8 Closest victim-accused relationship by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident (incidents directed against the person only)

	Other	Family	Stranger	Unknown	N/A	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	N	%
Total	49.2	8.8	25.5	6.6	9.8	13159	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)							
New Brunswick	75.9	7.2	11.4	1.8	3.6	166	1.3
Montreal	42.0	6.1	32.2	8.1	11.6	5001	38.0
other Quebec	53.8	12.3	12.8	12.0	9.1	2722	20.7
York Region	45.0	14.7	29.3	0.0	11.0	878	6.7
other Ontario	59.7	9.6	19.6	1.5	9.6	2157	16.4
Saskatchewan	54.1	9.1	26.1	5.4	5.3	1320	10.0
Vancouver	41.6	5.9	39.1	3.9	9.4	915	7.0
Gender of the accused							
Female	57.6	9.0	19.4	5.3	8.8	2468	18.8
Male	47.2	8.8	26.9	6.9	10.1	10691	81.2
Aboriginal status of the accused							
Not an aboriginal	49.2	8.8	25.4	6.6	10.0	12540	95.3
Aboriginal	47.8	9.7	28.6	6.9	6.9	619	4.7
Age of the accused							
12	63.9	6.5	18.3	4.8	6.5	725	5.5
13	59.5	10.0	17.8	5.8	6.8	1367	10.4
14	55.4	9.2	22.3	5.6	7.5	2256	17.1
15	50.1	8.6	25.2	6.5	9.7	2696	20.5
16	44.6	9.1	28.3	7.1	11.1	2904	22.1
17	40.5	8.7	30.5	7.9	12.5	3211	24.4
Evidence that the accused consumed alcohol or drugs							
No	49.4	8.9	25.0	6.7	10.1	12762	97.0
Yes	41.8	8.3	43.1	5.3	1.5	397	3.0
Co-accused adult in the incident							
No	51.9	9.3	23.1	6.3	9.4	11781	89.5
Yes	26.1	4.6	46.1	9.4	13.8	1378	10.5
Number of young persons implicated							
Only the accused	51.2	12.1	20.3	5.6	10.9	8966	68.1
1 or 2 co-accused youth	46.6	2.1	34.7	8.2	8.4	3370	25.6
3 or more co-accused youth	37.7	1.0	45.2	11.9	4.3	823	6.3

	Other %	Family %	Stranger %	Unknown %	N/A %	Total N	%
Type of weapon present							
Unknown or none	58.4	9.9	24.6	6.5	0.5	9139	69.5
Other weapon	40.7	9.5	35.9	8.6	5.3	2564	19.5
Firearm	18.4	2.1	39.0	12.0	28.5	484	3.7
Level of injury suffered by any victim							
Unknown or none	39.7	9.8	24.4	7.3	18.8	6881	52.3
Minor injury or death	60.7	8.2	25.2	5.9	0.0	5549	42.2
Major injury or death	50.8	4.3	38.7	6.3	0.0	729	5.5
Most serious violation							
Homicide, attempt murder	38.1	14.3	40.5	7.1	0.0	84	0.6
Other indictable person	39.6	5.2	39.0	9.4	6.7	4788	36.4
Sexual assault level 1	68.2	23.5	4.9	3.5	0.0	927	7.0
Assault level 1	53.1	9.3	19.2	5.2	13.2	7360	55.9

Table A-9 Type of weapon present by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident (incidents directed against the person only)

	None or unknown	Other weapon	Firearm	Total	
	%	%	%	N	%
Total	76.9	19.5	3.7	13159	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)					
New Brunswick	92.2	7.2	0.6	166	1.3
Montreal	73.4	22.0	4.6	5001	38.0
other Quebec	78.8	17.9	3.3	2722	20.7
York Region	74.5	21.9	3.6	878	6.7
other Ontario	83.9	14.7	1.3	2157	16.4
Saskatchewan	80.9	17.3	1.8	1320	10.0
Vancouver	66.7	24.9	8.4	915	7.0
Gender of the accused					
Female	88.1	11.2	0.7	2468	18.8
Male	74.2	21.4	4.4	10691	81.2
Aboriginal status of the accused					
Not an aboriginal	77.0	19.4	3.6	12540	95.3
Aboriginal	73.4	21.2	5.5	619	4.7
Age of the accused					
12	79.5	19.3	1.1	725	5.5
13	81.8	16.5	1.6	1367	10.4
14	79.4	18.4	2.2	2256	17.1
15	77.0	19.3	3.7	2696	20.5
16	74.6	21.7	3.7	2904	22.1
17	74.2	19.7	6.1	3211	24.4
Evidence that the accused consumed alcohol or drugs					
No	69.3	19.3	3.7	12762	97.0
Yes	73.3	24.7	2.0	397	3.0
Co-accused adult in the incident					
No	71.3	18.2	2.7	11781	89.5
Yes	53.6	30.6	12.3	1378	10.5
Number of young persons implicated					
Only the accused	80.6	17.0	2.5	8966	68.1
1 or 2 co-accused youth	70.8	22.9	6.3	3370	25.6
3 or more co-accused youth	61.2	32.4	6.3	823	6.3

	None or unknown %	Other weapon %	Firearm %	Total N	%
Closest victim-accused relationship					
Stranger	67.0	27.4	5.6	3359	25.5
Unknown	68.0	25.3	6.6	873	6.6
Family	78.2	21.0	0.9	1163	8.8
Other	82.5	16.1	1.4	6469	49.2
Level of injury suffered by any victim					
Unknown or none	61.5	19.0	5.4	6881	52.3
Minor injury	81.8	16.8	1.5	5549	42.2
Major injury or death	51.0	44.4	4.5	729	5.5
Most serious violation					
Homicide, attempt murder	9.5	75.0	15.5	84	0.6
Other indictable person	46.7	43.8	9.5	4788	36.4
Sexual assault level 1	98.0	2.0	0.0	927	7.0
Assault level 1	81.4	5.2	0.2	7360	55.9

Table A-10 Most serious injury suffered by any victim, by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident (incidents directed against the person only)

	None or unknown	Minor injury	Major injury or death	Total	
	%	%	%	N	%
Total	52.3	42.2	5.5	13159	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)					
New Brunswick	50.0	46.4	3.6	166	1.3
Montreal	52.7	41.9	5.4	5001	38.0
other Quebec	54.5	41.8	3.7	2722	20.7
York Region	50.7	44.4	4.9	878	6.7
other Ontario	49.3	46.5	4.2	2157	16.4
Saskatchewan	46.6	46.2	7.2	1320	10.0
Vancouver	60.8	26.0	13.2	915	7.0
Gender of the accused					
Female	45.1	50.5	4.3	2468	18.8
Male	53.9	40.2	5.8	10691	81.2
Aboriginal status of the accused					
Not an aboriginal	52.1	42.4	5.4	12540	95.3
Aboriginal	55.6	36.5	7.9	619	4.7
Age of the accused					
12	59.3	39.2	1.5	725	5.5
13	54.6	43.3	2.0	1367	10.4
14	53.6	42.5	3.9	2256	17.1
15	52.7	41.5	5.7	2696	20.5
16	49.4	44.0	6.6	2904	22.1
17	51.0	41.0	8.0	3211	24.4
Evidence that the accused consumed alcohol or drugs					
No	52.6	41.9	5.5	12762	97.0
Yes	41.8	50.9	7.3	397	3.0
Co-accused adult in the incident					
No	52.4	42.6	4.9	11781	89.5
Yes	51.0	38.3	10.7	1378	10.5
Number of young persons implicated					
Only the accused	53.4	41.9	4.7	8966	68.1
1 or 2 co-accused youth	50.1	44.1	5.9	3370	25.6
3 or more co-accused youth	49.2	36.9	13.9	823	6.3

	None or unknown %	Minor injury %	Major injury or death %	Total N	Total %
Closest victim-accused relationship					
Stranger	50.0	41.6	8.4	3359	25.5
Unknown	57.3	37.5	5.3	873	6.6
Family	58.1	39.2	2.7	1163	8.8
Other	42.2	52.1	5.7	6469	49.2
Type of weapon present					
Unknown or no weapon	46.3	49.6	4.1	9139	69.5
Other weapon	51.1	36.3	12.6	2564	19.5
Firearm	76.4	16.7	6.8	484	3.7
Most serious violation					
Homicide, attempt murder	9.5	10.7	79.8	84	0.6
Other indictable person	48.4	37.8	13.7	4788	36.4
Sexual assault level 1	87.6	12.4	0.0	927	7.0
Assault level 1	50.8	49.1	0.1	7360	55.9

Table A-11 Modus operandi is shoplifting, by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident (property incidents only)

	Not shoplifting	Shoplifting	Total	
	%	%	N	%
Total	82.0	18.0	67296	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)				
New Brunswick	60.8	39.2	768	1.1
Montreal	81.0	19.0	15358	22.8
other Quebec	92.4	7.6	22582	33.6
York Region	90.4	9.6	8308	12.3
other Ontario	69.6	30.4	8656	12.9
Saskatchewan	67.4	32.6	9100	13.5
Vancouver	69.4	30.6	2524	3.8
Gender of the accused				
Female	40.0	60.0	9221	13.7
Male	88.7	11.3	58075	86.3
Aboriginal status of the accused				
Not an aboriginal	82.1	17.9	63572	94.5
Aboriginal	80.5	19.5	3724	5.5
Age of the accused				
12	72.9	27.1	3715	5.5
13	72.0	28.0	6488	9.6
14	76.8	23.2	11297	16.8
15	81.0	19.0	14020	20.8
16	86.5	13.5	16169	24.0
17	88.4	11.6	15607	23.2
Co-accused adult in the incident				
No	79.9	20.1	57516	85.5
Yes	94.3	5.7	9780	14.5
Number of young persons implicated				
Only the accused	78.5	21.5	29117	43.3
1 or 2 co-accused youth	82.1	17.9	31163	46.3
3 or more co-accused youth	95.9	4.1	7016	10.4
Value of property involved				
0- $25	62.2	37.8	15602	23.2
$26 - 99	56.4	43.6	9868	14.7
$100-499	89.7	10.3	16977	25.2
$500-999	98.7	1.3	7390	11.0
$1,000 +	99.5	0.5	13192	19.6

	Not shoplifting	Shoplifting	Total	
	%	%	N	%
Most serious violation				
Possess stolen property	70.1	29.9	4803	7.1
Fraud	99.6	0.4	1660	2.5
Other indictable property	98.7	1.3	7580	11.3
Theft under	60.1	39.9	26494	39.4

Table A-12 Value of property involved, by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident (incidents involving property only)

	$0 - 25	$26 - 99	$100 - 499	$500 - 999	$1,000 or more	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	N	%
Total	25.5	15.6	27.2	11.4	20.3	66136	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)							
New Brunswick	37.5	24.6	18.1	7.0	12.8	725	1.1
Montreal	23.3	15.6	27.3	11.9	21.9	16418	24.8
other Quebec	17.4	15.0	30.6	13.1	23.8	22558	34.1
York Region	15.5	10.1	30.8	17.4	26.2	7918	12.0
other Ontario	42.3	17.0	20.9	6.5	13.3	8046	12.2
Saskatchewan	37.7	19.8	22.2	7.0	13.3	8102	12.3
Vancouver	46.9	17.6	23.4	6.0	6.1	2369	3.6
Gender of the accused							
Female	39.6	28.0	20.9	4.7	6.8	9212	13.9
Male	23.2	13.6	28.2	12.5	22.5	56924	86.1
Aboriginal status of the accused							
Not an aboriginal	25.4	15.5	27.3	11.5	20.3	62853	95.0
Aboriginal	27.4	17.1	25.6	9.6	20.3	3283	5.0
Age of the accused							
12	35.2	19.5	25.3	9.7	10.4	3686	5.6
13	35.9	19.7	25.6	8.8	10.0	6408	9.7
14	30.2	18.2	26.8	9.7	15.1	11136	16.8
15	24.9	15.7	27.5	11.0	20.8	13728	20.8
16	21.1	13.4	28.7	12.8	24.0	15820	23.9
17	20.3	13.3	26.8	13.1	26.4	15358	23.2
Evidence that the accused consumed alcohol or drugs							
No	25.4	15.6	27.2	11.5	20.3	66037	99.9
Yes	40.4	12.1	26.3	4.0	17.2	99	0.2
Co-accused adult in the incident							
No	26.9	16.6	27.3	10.9	18.3	56460	85.4
Yes	16.9	9.6	26.7	14.7	32.1	9676	14.6
Number of young persons implicated							
Only the accused	28.4	15.6	26.3	10.3	19.4	28625	43.3
1 or 2 co-accused youth	24.4	16.8	28.1	11.1	19.6	30581	46.2
3 or more co-accused youth	18.2	10.1	26.7	17.6	27.4	6930	10.5

	$0 - 25	$26 - 99	$100 - 499	$500 - 999	$1,000 or more	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	N	%
Type of incident							
Against the person	37.7	15.2	33.8	5.8	7.5	2824	4.3
Against property	24.8	15.7	26.9	11.7	20.9	63029	95.3
Other	60.1	8.1	19.4	4.9	7.4	283	0.4
Modus operandi was shoplifting							
No	20.2	11.1	30.1	13.8	24.8	53970	81.6
Yes	48.8	35.5	14.4	0.8	0.5	12166	18.4
Most serious violation							
Against the person							
Homicide, attempt murder	71.4	0.0	7.1	0.0	21.4	14	0.0
Other indictable person	34.1	16.6	36.0	5.2	8.0	2153	3.3
Sexual assault level 1	95.7	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	23	0.0
Assault level 1	47.2	11.4	27.9	7.9	5.7	634	1.0
Against property							
Possess stolen property	34.0	29.2	25.6	6.7	4.5	2283	3.5
Fraud	27.9	18.8	33.5	11.6	8.1	1482	2.2
Break and enter	17.1	11.3	28.5	14.2	28.9	16418	24.8
Other indictable property	11.3	0.8	2.8	1.5	83.6	7341	11.1
Theft under	34.7	22.6	26.7	12.4	3.6	26050	39.4
Mischief	18.4	11.8	43.0	14.7	12.1	9455	14.3
Other							
Administration of justice	53.8	2.6	29.5	3.8	10.3	78	0.1
Indictable drug	92.6	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.7	27	0.0
Weapons	34.3	14.3	31.4	5.7	14.3	35	0.1
Summary/hybrid drug	83.3	13.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	30	0.0
Miscellaneous	58.4	10.6	17.7	7.1	6.2	113	0.2

Table A-13 Most serious violation in the incident, by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident (incidents involving offences against the person only)

	Homicide, attempt murder	Other indictable person	Sexual assault level 1	Assault level 1	Total	
	%	%	%	%	N	%
Total	0.6	36.4	7.0	55.9	13159	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)						
New Brunswick	0.0	18.1	15.7	66.3	166	1.3
Montreal	0.9	41.8	4.2	53.1	5001	38.0
other Quebec	0.7	30.3	10.4	58.7	2722	20.7
York Region	0.1	33.5	9.3	57.1	878	6.7
other Ontario	0.2	24.5	9.1	66.2	2157	16.4
Saskatchewan	0.8	38.9	6.8	53.4	1320	10.0
Vancouver	0.4	55.4	4.4	39.8	915	7.0
Gender of the accused						
Female	0.3	25.0	1.1	73.7	2468	18.8
Male	0.7	39.0	8.4	51.8	10691	81.2
Aboriginal status of the accused						
Not an aboriginal	0.6	36.0	7.0	56.4	12540	95.3
Aboriginal	1.0	44.3	8.1	46.7	619	4.7
Age of the accused						
12	0.1	26.5	11.2	62.2	725	5.5
13	0.1	29.8	10.2	59.9	1367	10.4
14	0.2	33.4	8.7	57.7	2256	17.1
15	0.7	36.5	6.9	55.8	2696	20.5
16	1.0	39.3	5.2	54.5	2904	22.1
17	0.8	40.8	5.4	53.0	3211	24.4
Evidence that the accused consumed alcohol or drugs						
No	0.6	36.2	7.1	56.0	12762	97.0
Yes	1.8	42.1	4.0	52.1	397	3.0
Co-accused adult in the incident						
No	0.6	33.1	7.6	58.7	11781	89.5
Yes	1.3	64.2	2.2	32.3	1378	10.5
Number of young persons implicated in the incident						
Only the accused	0.5	29.3	8.6	61.6	8966	68.1
1 or 2 co-accused youth	0.9	48.9	3.7	46.5	3370	25.6
3 or more co-accused youth	1.2	62.8	3.5	32.4	823	6.3

	Homicide, attempt murder	Other indictable person	Sexual assault level 1	Assault level 1	Total	
	%	%	%	%	N	%
Closest victim-accused relationship						
N/A	0.0	24.9	0.0	75.1	1295	9.8
Stranger	1.0	55.6	1.3	42.0	3359	25.5
Unknown	0.7	51.8	3.7	43.9	873	6.6
Family	1.0	21.3	18.7	58.9	1163	8.8
Other	0.5	29.3	9.8	60.4	6469	49.2
Type of weapon present						
Unknown or none	0.1	24.4	9.9	65.5	9139	69.5
Other weapon	2.5	81.9	0.7	14.9	2564	19.5
Firearm	2.7	94.0	0.0	3.3	484	3.7
Level of injury suffered by any victim						
Unknown or none	0.1	33.7	11.8	54.4	6881	52.3
Minor injury or death	0.2	32.6	2.1	65.1	5549	42.2
Major injury or death	9.2	90.3	0.0	0.5	729	5.5

Table A-14 Most serious violation in the incident, by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident (incidents involving offences against property only)

	Possess stolen property	Fraud	Break and enter	Other indictable property	Theft under	Mischief	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	N	%
Total	7.1	2.5	25.7	11.3	39.4	14.1	67296	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)								
New Brunswick	5.6	3.6	16.9	7.4	56.3	10.2	768	1.1
Montreal	8.9	2.4	18.5	14.7	42.2	13.4	15358	22.8
other Quebec	3.1	1.8	38.2	10.1	29.5	17.2	22582	33.6
York Region	10.2	1.9	24.0	14.3	40.2	9.4	8308	12.3
other Ontario	7.3	3.6	18.3	8.7	46.5	15.5	8656	12.9
Saskatchewan	10.1	3.3	20.5	6.1	48.1	11.8	9100	13.5
Vancouver	11.8	3.2	9.9	18.9	46.4	9.7	2524	3.8
Gender of the accused								
Female	11.6	4.8	8.7	4.5	64.2	6.1	9221	13.7
Male	6.4	2.1	28.4	12.3	35.4	15.3	58075	86.3
Aboriginal status of the accused								
Not an aboriginal	6.9	2.5	25.1	11.3	39.8	14.3	63572	94.5
Aboriginal	11.8	1.3	36.1	10.2	31.3	9.4	3724	5.5
Age of the accused								
12	4.5	0.6	18.1	5.8	43.0	27.9	3715	5.5
13	6.3	1.2	18.8	6.5	44.9	22.4	6488	9.6
14	6.8	1.2	23.6	8.5	43.0	16.9	11297	16.8
15	7.4	2.0	25.6	12.4	39.8	12.9	14020	20.8
16	7.4	3.2	27.7	13.0	37.5	11.3	16169	24.0
17	8.0	4.0	30.0	13.8	35.1	9.2	15607	23.2
Co-accused adult								
No	7.2	2.4	22.8	10.8	41.4	15.2	57516	85.5
Yes	6.7	2.6	42.6	13.7	27.3	7.1	9780	14.5
Number of young persons implicated								
Only the accused	8.3	3.9	20.7	11.6	42.9	12.6	29117	43.3
1 or 2 co-accused youth	6.5	1.5	28.8	10.7	38.2	14.3	31163	46.3
3 or more co-accused youth	5.2	0.8	32.9	12.2	30.1	18.7	7016	10.4
Modus operandi								
Not shoplifting	6.1	3.0	31.4	13.6	28.9	17.1	55184	82.0
Shoplifting	11.9	N/A	N/A	0.8	87.2	N/A	12112	18.0

	Possess stolen property	Fraud	Break and enter	Other indictable property	Theft under	Mischief	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	N	%
Value of property involved								
0- $25	5.0	2.7	18.0	5.3	57.9	11.2	15602	23.2
$26 - 99	6.8	2.8	18.8	0.6	59.7	11.3	9868	14.7
$100-499	3.4	2.9	27.5	1.2	40.9	23.9	16977	25.2
$500-999	2.1	2.3	31.6	1.5	43.8	18.8	7390	11.0
$1,000 +	0.8	0.9	36.0	46.5	7.1	8.7	13192	19.6

Table A-15 Most serious violation in the incident, by characteristics of the accused youth and circumstances of the incident (incidents involving "other" offences only)

	Admin. of justice	Indict-able drug	Traffic	Morals	Weapons	Summary /hybrid drug	Misc.	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	N	%
Total	53.3	7.0	7.6	1.9	5.2	8.5	16.4	13766	100.0
Region (grouped police jurisdiction)									
New Brunswick	72.1	0.5	6.0	0.0	3.5	2.5	15.4	201	1.5
Montreal	27.2	8.7	6.3	3.1	7.9	13.0	33.8	2127	15.5
other Quebec	37.6	15.9	10.6	0.5	2.9	15.4	17.1	3794	27.6
York Region	43.9	5.6	14.4	1.1	10.4	12.4	12.3	751	5.5
other Ontario	65.3	1.7	4.3	1.7	7.3	3.2	16.6	2391	17.4
Saskatchewan	80.6	0.3	5.5	1.5	3.2	1.2	7.7	3881	28.2
Vancouver	26.2	13.8	12.6	11.1	8.7	14.5	13.0	621	4.5
Gender of the accused									
Female	56.4	4.4	3.8	5.7	1.8	5.6	22.4	2742	19.9
Male	52.5	7.7	8.6	1.0	6.1	9.3	15.0	11024	80.1
Aboriginal status of the accused									
Not an aboriginal	52.5	7.2	7.6	1.8	5.3	8.8	16.8	12933	93.9
Aboriginal	65.2	3.6	9.1	3.6	3.5	4.7	10.3	833	6.1
Age of the accused									
12	55.0	2.7	3.1	0.3	7.9	1.7	29.2	291	2.1
13	56.2	4.2	2.4	1.5	6.3	6.8	22.6	858	6.2
14	57.9	6.6	2.9	1.9	6.5	6.6	17.6	1772	12.9
15	57.0	7.2	4.4	1.5	5.7	8.5	15.8	2798	20.3
16	51.4	8.2	8.0	2.1	5.4	9.4	15.5	3505	25.5
17	49.9	7.0	12.5	2.2	3.8	9.4	15.1	4542	33.0
Evidence that the accused consumed alcohol or drugs									
No	53.3	7.0	7.5	1.9	5.2	8.5	16.5	13751	99.9
Yes	N/A	N/A	100.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15	0.1
Co-accused adult in the incident									
No	56.0	6.0	7.8	1.8	5.1	8.0	15.3	12945	94.0
Yes	9.9	23.6	5.0	3.9	6.9	16.2	34.5	821	6.0

	Admin. of justice	Indict-able drug	Traffic	Morals	Weapons	Summary hybrid drug	Misc.	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	N	%
Number of young persons implicated in the incident									
Only the accused	57.9	6.3	8.2	2.0	4.1	7.9	13.6	11952	86.8
1 or 2 co-accused youth	25.7	10.9	4.1	1.0	11.8	13.3	33.2	1536	11.2
3 or more co-accused youth	6.1	16.9	4.3	0.0	16.5	7.9	48.2	278	2.0
Value of property involved									
0- $25	24.7	14.7	N/A	N/A	7.1	14.7	38.8	170	1.2
$26 - 99	8.7	0.0	N/A	N/A	21.7	17.4	52.2	23	0.2
$100-499	41.8	1.8	N/A	N/A	20.0	0.0	36.4	55	0.4
$500-999	21.4	0.0	N/A	N/A	14.3	7.1	57.1	14	0.1
$1,000 +	38.1	4.8	N/A	N/A	23.8	0.0	33.3	21	0.2